

MAR 2 1950

VOLUME XLV

*Desk*

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

NUMBER 1

*January 1950*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*  
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
RICHARD TREAT BRUÈRE

CARL DARLING BUCK  
BENEDICT EINARSON  
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD P. McKEON  
RALPH MARCUS  
GERTRUDE SMITH

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PHILIP HOWARD DE LACY, *Washington University*  
ROBERT J. GETTY, *University of Toronto*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK, *Harvard University*  
BEN EDWIN PERRY, *University of Illinois*  
RODNEY POTTER ROBINSON, *University of Cincinnati*

VOL. XLV

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1950

No. 1

Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the <i>Aeneid</i> . . . . .	Robert J. Getty	1
Lucius Domitius Domitianus Augustus . . . . .	Allan Chester Johnson	13
Julian of Aescalon on Strabo and the Stade . . . . .	Aubrey Diller	22
Zeit und Zweck der pseudoxenophontischen <i>Athenaion politeia</i> . . . . .	Ernst Hohl	26
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		36
ARCHIBALD W. ALLEN: Notes on Propertius i. 2 and i. 8.—ALBERT H. TRAVIS: Addendum to "Donatus and the Scholia Danielsi."—REVILLO P. OLIVER: The <i>Oedipus</i> of Plautus.		

Book Reviews . . . . .		41
W. W. TARN: <i>Alexander the Great</i> (Bickerman).—EMMA J. EDELSTEIN and LUDWIG EDELSTEIN: <i>Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonia</i> (Nock).—CARLO ANTI: <i>Teatri greci arcaici da Minosse a Pericle</i> (Johnson).—ALBIN LESKY: <i>Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer</i> (Starr).—BENEDETTO RIPOBATTI: <i>Studi sui "Topica" di Cicerone</i> (De Lacy).—M. L. W. LAIBTNER: <i>The Greater Roman Historians</i> (Larsen).—ANTHONY M. YOUNG: <i>Tray and Her Legend</i> (Avery).—DOROTHY BURR THOMPSON: <i>Sivans and Amber: Some Early Greek Lyrics Freely Translated and Adapted</i> (Lind).—J. H. WASSINK (ed.): <i>Tertulliani De anima</i> (Whatmough).—MANA: <i>Introduction à l'histoire des religions</i> , Vol. II: <i>Les Religions de l'Europe ancienne</i> , Part III (Whatmough).—PIERRE LOUIS (ed.): <i>Albinos Epitome</i> (Solmsen).—AXEL BÖETHIUS: <i>Roman and Greek Town Architecture</i> (Thompson).—J. A. K. THOMSON: <i>The Classical Background of English Literature</i> (Hutton).—C. E. ROBINSON: <i>Hellas: A Short History of Ancient Greece</i> (Roebuck).—L. L. HAMMERICK: <i>Laryngeal before Sonant</i> (Whatmough).—LOUIS E. LORD: <i>A History of the American School of Classical Studies, 1882-1948</i> (Johnson).—KENNETH M. SETTON: <i>Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1398</i> (Joranson).—GOTTFRIED ALBERT KELLER: <i>Eratothenes und die alexandrinische Sterndichtung</i> (Solmsen).—ALEXANDRE ALBENQUE: <i>Inventory de l'archéologie gallo-romaine du département de l'Aveyron</i> (Larsen).		

Books Received . . . . .		71
--------------------------	--	----

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box 1, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$6.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.79); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.85). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire, except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately. The post-office does not forward second-class mail.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

mati

1

1

13

22

26

36

41

71

1,

le

of

ar;

ge

he

al

on

es

or

e,

on

b-

ek

id

t-

2.

n

C

Vo

T

wh  
acc  
the  
pos  
is  
(75  
fan  
wit  
ha  
sio  
res  
as  
int  
des  
kin  
fiv  
fin  
an  
Ro  
Ro

Has  
earl  
pas  
the  
"ba  
the  
Aer  
D. x  
[Cla



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLV

JANUARY 1950

Number 1

## ROMULUS, ROMA, AND AUGUSTUS IN THE SIXTH BOOK OF THE *AENEID*

ROBERT J. GETTY

### I. INTRODUCTORY

THE sixth book is, in the words of J. W. Mackail's fine simile, the great central dome of the basilica which is the whole *Aeneid*; and the long account given by the shade of Anchises of the glorious pageant of Alban and Roman posterity is its culmination.<sup>1</sup> This speech is symmetrically constructed. Four lines (756-59) form the introduction, and the famous contrast of Roman imperialism with Greek art and science (847-53) would have been in itself a magnificent conclusion, had not Anchises paused (854) and resumed with the praises of the Marcelli as an epilogue (855-86). But between the introduction and this vindication of the destiny of Rome comes the muster-roll of kings and heroes. It may be divided into five sections which are both clearly defined and artistically connected: (i) Silvius and the kings of Alba Longa (760-76); (ii) Romulus, followed by a description of Roma or Rome and a preparatory but

specific announcement of Augustus, along with the whole of the *gens Iulia* (777-90); (iii) Augustus and his exploits, which excel even those of Hercules and Liber (791-807); (iv) the kings of Rome who followed Romulus, beginning with Numa and ending with Tarquin the Proud and his fate (808-18); (v) the heroes of the Republic (819-46), with an internal digression to include the protagonists of the Civil War (826-35).

In the third or central section Augustus is clearly marked in Vergil's mind for ultimate deification. Having been announced with the words:

hic Caesar et omnis Iuli  
progenies magnum caeli ventura sub axem,  
[789-90],<sup>2</sup>

he is then described as "Augustus Caesar, Divi genus" (792).<sup>3</sup> The significance of

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Butler (*The Sixth Book of the Aeneid* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1920], p. 244) rightly emphasized that "Caesar" is not Julius but Augustus, and J. W. Mackail (*The Aeneid*, pp. 246-47) agreed. The anaphora of *hic* in 789 and in 791, "*hic vir, hic est*," makes this certain. See n. 49, below.

<sup>2</sup> For discussions of the date (as early as 42 or as late as 38 B.C.) when he received the title of *Divi filius*, see K. Fitzler and O. Seeck, *RE*, X, 276, s.v. "Iulius (Augustus)"; G. Herzog-Hauser, *RE*, Supplementband IV, 826, s.v. "Kaiserkult (Augustus)"; Hubert Heinen, "Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultes," *Klio*, XI (1911), 129-77, esp. 140, n. 2; and Mommsen's notes, *CIL*, I, 54; *Staatsrecht*, II, 756, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> F. W. H. Myers in his essay entitled "Virgil" in *Essays—Classical* (London, 1888), p. 171, called the earlier speech of Anchises (vi. 724-51) "the central passage of the *Aeneid*"; but even it is introductory to the vision of the future of Rome. For Mackail's "basilica" simile see his *Virgil and His Meaning to the World of To-day* (Boston, 1922), p. 95 = *The Aeneid*, ed. J. W. Mackail (Oxford, 1930), Intro., p. xliii.

the name "Augustus" in relation to Romulus has been stressed by various writers.<sup>4</sup> Following the hint given by Suetonius,<sup>5</sup> they point out that Octavian was probably grateful for his new title to the familiar line of Ennius: "Augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est,"<sup>6</sup> which alluded to the famous augury whereby Romulus established his right to become the first founder of the city. Suetonius also stated that the assumption of the name "Augustus" was decided "cum, quibusdam censentibus Romulum appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis, praevaluisset, ut Augustus potius vocaretur, non tantum novo sed etiam ampliore cognomine." Accordingly, as La Cerda remarked, Vergil, in the speech of Anchises, "excellenti iudicio post Romulum infert Augustum quasi alterum conditorem urbis."<sup>7</sup> The poet's reasons for interrupting the chronological order of the Roman kings so that Augustus could be

introduced immediately after Romulus and before Numa have been well stated by Kenneth Scott as follows: "Vergil has tried to connect Augustus closely with Romulus and Numa and has tried to present them all as founders of Rome and its greatness, Romulus as the builder of the walls and the warrior, Numa as the law-giver, and Augustus as the founder of the Golden Age of peace and prosperity through the virtues of both Romulus and Numa."<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Augustine told more specifically in the *De civitate Dei* how, just as Romulus was the founder of Rome, so Christ was the founder of the Church.<sup>9</sup>

Romulus, then, in the second section foreshadows the central figure of Augustus in the third, for Augustus is greater than he and has a title with more extensive implications—*ampliore cognomine*, as Suetonius described it. Furthermore, a veiled allusion earlier in the speech has already hinted why Rome's second founder is greater than the first. Before Romulus is introduced, the Alban kings appear in the first section wearing the oak crown: "umbrata gerunt civili tempora quercu" (772); and H. E. Butler has rightly remarked of this *corona civica*: "It was conferred on Augustus . . . , and here, perhaps, as a delicate compliment to Augustus, appears as one of the *insignia* of the good Kings of old."<sup>10</sup> Nor is this the only passage in *Aeneid* vi where an event of Vergil's own time is anticipated within the legendary setting of the poem, for in verses 69-70 Aeneas promises to do what Octavian was destined to perform in 28 B.C., when he dedicated the temple of Apollo on the Palatine:

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Kenneth Scott, "The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus," *TAPA*, LVI (1925), 82-105, esp. 84-91 and the bibliography there cited; Gertrude Hirst, "The Significance of Augustus as Applied to Hercules and to Romulus: A Note on Livy I, 7, 9 and I, 8, 9," *AJP*, XLVII (1926), 347-57; Jean Gagé, "Romulus-Augustus," *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.*, XLVII (1930), 138-81; Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, Conn.: American Philological Assoc., 1931), pp. 158-60. Andreas Alföldi, "Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser," *Röm. Mitt.*, L (1935), 1-171, gives on p. 100, n. 1, a useful bibliography for Augustus as Romulus, to which now add Dag Norberg, "La Divinité d'Auguste dans Horace," *Eranos* (Rudbergianus), LIV (1946), 389-403, esp. 392-94. For emperor cults generally, see Julien Tondriaux, "Bibliographie du culte des souverains hellénistes et romains," *Bull. Assoc. Guillaume Budé*, No. 5 (new ser.; June, 1948), pp. 106-25.

<sup>5</sup> *Div. Aug.* 7. See V. Ehrenberg, "Monumentum Antiochenum," *Klio*, XIX (1925), 189-213, esp. 209.

<sup>6</sup> *Annales* 502, ed. Vahlen (2d ed.; 1903).

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by E. Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI* (3d ed.; Leipzig and Berlin, 1926), p. 315 on vi. 752-886. For the choice of the name "Augustus" see also Dio Cass. xlv. 46. 2-3; lili. 16. 6-8 (cf. lvi. 46. 2); Florus ii. 34 (iv. 12). 66; Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 292; ad *Georg.* lili. 27; and various discussions in modern times, e.g., F. Haverfield, "The Name Augustus," *JRS*, V (1915), 249-50; M. A. Koops, "De Augusto," *Mnemosyne*, V (1918), 34-39.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>9</sup> xxii. 6.

<sup>10</sup> It was conferred in 27 B.C. Butler (*op. cit.*, p. 240) cites Dio Cass. lili. 16. 4. See also *Mon. Anc.* 6. 16; *CIL*, I, 231; and cf. Val. Max. ii. 8. 7; Sen. Clem. i. 26. 5. The bibliography given by Alföldi, *op. cit.*, p. 11, n. 1, is useful.

tum Phoebō et Triviae solido de marmore  
templum  
institutam festosque dies de nomine Phoebi.

Here Servius aptly remarked of the poet,  
"ut solet, miscet historiam."

The full significance of the oak crown was explained by a later Augustan poet, who felt himself able to dispense with Vergilian tact and reticence. Ovid in the *Tristia* made it obvious:

singula dum miror, video fulgentibus armis  
conspicuos postes tectaque digna deo,  
et "Iovis haec" dixi "domus est?" quod ut esse  
putarem,  
augurium menti querna corona dabat.  
cuius ut accepi dominum, "non fallimur"  
inquam,  
"et magni verum est hanc Iovis esse domum" [iii. 1. 33-38].

The oak crown was attached over the doorway of the house of Augustus on the Palatine and symbolized not only the preservation of the lives of Roman citizens but also, as Ovid openly said, the divinity of Jupiter.<sup>11</sup> In the *Fasti* the oak wreath is similarly associated with the dignity and, indeed, the divinity of Augustus, whose name is etymologically explained in the same context:

sancta vocant augusta patres, augusta vocantur  
templa sacerdotum rite dicata manu;  
huius et augurium dependet origine verbi  
et quodcumque sua Iuppiter auget ope.  
augeat imperium nostri ducis, augeat annos,  
protegat et vestras querna corona fores,  
auspiciisque deis tanti cognominis heres  
omine suscipiat, quo pater, orbis onus  
[i. 609-16].<sup>12</sup>

Previously, Ovid had remarked that the princeps holds the name "Augustus" in common with Jupiter: "hic socium sum-

mo cum Iove nomen habet" (608); and he proceeded to say explicitly in the next book that the emperor was greater than Romulus because he was the earthly Jupiter:

hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,  
nomen habes, hominum tu pater, ille deum.  
Romule, concedes! [ii. 131-33.]

Romulus was only *dominus*, Augustus was of higher rank, for he was *princeps* and *pater*:

tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet;  
te Remus incesat: veniam dedit hostibus ille;  
caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem  
[ii. 142-44].<sup>13</sup>

There is no better commentator on the indirectness of Vergil than the direct Ovid. He was enough of a poet to understand and develop his master's latent meaning, but, even where he attempted to imitate Vergilian symbolism and allusion, his manner was self-conscious. For example, in speaking of the Milky Way, which led to the "magni tecta Tonantis/regalemque domum," he added:

hic locus est, quem si verbis audacia detur,  
haud timeam magni dixisse Palatia caeli.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> In the concluding couplet, *heres* is usually understood of Tiberius and *pater* of Augustus. But the two lines probably stood in the original version of the *Fasti* and therefore were written before the death of Augustus. If, then, Augustus himself is the *heres*, Ovid implies that the *pater* is either Julius Caesar or Jupiter; cf. *Met.* xv. 852-60, where Augustus is said to be greater than Julius, just as Jupiter is greater than Saturn. The comparison is instructive (see below, p. 12). Ovid concludes this tribute to Augustus by remarking of both him and Jupiter: "pater est et rector uterque" (the one on earth and the other in heaven). In Manil. i. 9, "concessumque patri mundum deus ipse mereris," the ambiguity may be deliberate, but it is more likely that *patri* is Jupiter (see Margaret M. Ward, "The Association of Augustus with Jupiter," *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, IX [1933], 203-24, esp. 205 and n. 2).

<sup>12</sup> See Katharine Allen, "The Fasti of Ovid and the Augustan Propaganda," *AJP*, XLIII (1922), 250-66, esp. 256-57.

<sup>13</sup> *Met.* i. 170-71, 175-76. For Ovid's equation of Augustus and Jupiter see Kenneth Scott, "Emperor Worship in Ovid," *TAPA*, LXI (1930), 43-69, esp. 52-58.

<sup>14</sup> See Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 161. The indices to A. B. Cook's *Zeus* (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1914, 1925, 1940) supply additional information about the oak wreath of Zeus-Jupiter in Hellenistic and Roman times.

Horace, however, in complimenting the princeps on his affinity with Jupiter, was less subtle than Vergil and more tactful than Ovid. Vergil in the *Aeneid* merely hinted that Augustus was the earthly Jove; Ovid said so flatly; Horace achieved his duty as a courtier by parallelism and a prediction:

caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem  
regnare: praesens divus habebitur  
Augustus [*Carm.* iii. 5. 1-3].

The complex and changing attitude of Vergil to the divinity of Augustus has been discussed in detail elsewhere, notably by Lily Ross Taylor and Cyril Bailey.<sup>15</sup> In the *Eclogues* gratitude prompted the poet to regard Octavian as a god and to imply, like Horace, that he was more *praesens* than other gods.<sup>16</sup> In the *Georgics* Vergil was more cautious in deferring to Octavian's wish not to become a god in his lifetime; but, as Bailey has remarked, he appears also to have protested against this postponement of deification.<sup>17</sup> As for the *Aeneid*, it is the aim of this paper to corroborate the view that Augustus was regarded by Vergil not only as a second Romulus but also as Jupiter's vice-regent on earth.

Hitherto scanty justice has been done to the divinity of Augustus as reflected in the *Aeneid* and, more particularly, to Vergil's identification of him with Jupiter. Margaret M. Ward has collected much valuable information about the Augustus-Jupiter equation in an article which may be described as the most authoritative on this subject so far.<sup>18</sup> But in dealing with the poets of the age she has overlooked

Vergil, apart from quoting an epigram of which he may have been the author:

nocte pluit tota, redeunt at mane serena.  
commune imperium cum Iove, Caesar,  
agis.<sup>19</sup>

Others, for example, who have ignored his elusive subtlety are Tenney Frank, who could write: "Later when Vergil was writing the *Aeneid* he frequently speaks of the great Augustus, but never as *divine*,"<sup>20</sup> and Karl Hönn, who, in discussing the princeps in relation to Jupiter, mentions Horace and Ovid but not Vergil.<sup>21</sup> Lily Ross Taylor, however, has qualified her statement: "The *Aeneid* has nothing to say of the divinity of Augustus and nothing directly of the apotheosis to come to him after his death" particularly by adding:

In Anchises' speech in the sixth book the emperor is compared in his deeds with Hercules and Liber, though, unlike Horace, Vergil makes no definite reference to Augustus' acquisition of a divinity like theirs. But the expectation is certainly implied, for in an earlier portion of the speech divinity is promised for all the house of the Julii (789 f.). . . . But in general in the *Aeneid* Vergil is concerned with the Julii as descendants of the gods rather than as ancestors of gods yet to be.<sup>22</sup>

In the later art of the Augustan age, the well-known Vienna Cameo or Gemma Augustea<sup>23</sup> concurred with Vergil in rep-

<sup>15</sup> E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latinae minores*, IV, 156, No. 155 = F. Buecheler and A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I, 212, No. 256.

<sup>16</sup> "Augustus, Vergil, and the Augustan Elogia," *AJP*, LIX (1938), 91-94, esp. 92.

<sup>17</sup> *Augustus und seine Zeit* (3d ed.; Vienna, 1943), p. 125.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 174-76.

<sup>19</sup> A. Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1900), II, 257, Pl. LVI; F. Eichler and E. Kris, *Die Kameen im kunsthistorischen Museum* (Vienna, 1927), p. 52, No. 7, Pl. 4; *CAH*, Pl. IV, 156a. H. B. Walters, *The Art of the Romans* (2d ed.; London, 1928), p. 119; P. Ducati, *L'Arte in Roma* (Bologna, 1938), p. 142, Pl. 81; D. Mustilli in *Augustus: Studi in occasione del bimillenario Augusteo* (Rome, 1938).

<sup>15</sup> Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-15, 174-78; Bailey, *Religion in Virgil* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 191-96.

<sup>16</sup> I. 6-8, 41.

<sup>17</sup> I. 24-42, 503-4; III. 13-48; IV. 560-62; Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 203-24.

representing the princeps with the attributes of both Jupiter and Romulus. He appears there half-draped, with Jupiter's eagle at his feet and scepter in his left hand, and with Oecumene (if she is not Cybele) about to crown him with the oak wreath; but he also holds the augural *lituus* of Romulus in his right hand. Otto Brendel has remarked: "The emperor, holding, as he does, not a thunderbolt, but the curved *lituus*, is not, however, meant to be Jupiter himself. The curved *lituus* connects him with Romulus, who was the first Augur."<sup>24</sup> But why should he not be represented with the attributes of both?

## II. ROMULUS

quin et avo comitem sese Mavortius addet  
Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater  
educet. viden, ut geminae stant vertice cristae  
et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?  
[777-80.]

i) *Verse 779*.—Though Norden despaired of finding either a numismatic or a literary parallel for the double-crested helmet of Romulus,<sup>25</sup> Servius should have guided later commentators to the true explanation (a) by narrating what happened after the death of Remus *ad Aen. i. 276*: "... Remo scilicet interempto, post cuius

mortem natam constat pestilentiam. unde consulta oracula dixerunt placandos esse manes fratris extincti; ob quam rem sella curulis cum sceptro et corona et ceteris regni insignibus semper iuxta sancientem aliquid Romulum ponebatur, ut pariter imperare viderentur," or (b) in observing *ad loc.*: "omnino in omnibus hoc egit Romulus, ut cum fratre regnare videretur, ne se reum parricidii iudicaret; unde omnia duplicia habuit, quasi cum fratre communia." Byzantine authorities also vouch for the tradition that Romulus consulted an oracle because of various disorders in Rome after he had slain his brother and was told that the city would have no internal peace unless Remus were associated with him in the government. Therefore, he made a golden statue of his brother, placed it beside himself on his throne and thenceforward used the plural in all his official decrees.<sup>26</sup> It is possible that Vergil was thinking of Romulus-Quirinus as endowed with the dual attributes of himself and his deceased twin when he mentioned the *geminas cristas*, a phrase which suggests the "geminus sub rupe Quirinos" of Juvenal.<sup>27</sup> At any rate, he was aware of the divine partnership between Quirinus and Remus when he wrote "Remo cum fratre Quirinus/iura dabunt."<sup>28</sup>

As Scott has observed, there are two passages in the literature of the Augustan age in which Octavian seems to be called *Quirinus*. In one (*Georg. iii. 27*), the description of the sculptures that are to represent Actium, Vergil refers to him in the words *victorisque*

pp. 349-50, all have followed Furtwängler in assigning the Vienna Cameo to Dioscurides (ca. A.D. 12). M. Rostovtzeff (*A History of the Ancient World*, Vol. II: *Rome* [Oxford, 1927], p. 186) has described it as Tiberian.

<sup>24</sup> "The Great Augustus Cameo at Vienna," *AJA*, XLIII (1939), 307-8. For the augural *lituus* see Alföldi, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25; and for references in literature to the *lituus* and the scepter of Romulus-Quirinus see Wissowa in Roscher's *Lexikon*, IV, 17, s.v. "Quirinus."

<sup>25</sup> The usual explanation that this was the helmet of Mars depends (a) on an incorrect translation of vs. 780 (see below) and (b) on the "galea . . . duabus distincta pinnis" of Mars, the father of Romulus, in Val. Max. i. 8. 6; but, as Heyne hinted, this parallel is untrustworthy. Valerius Maximus, as I suspect, may have falsely inferred from the Vergilian context that *pater ipse* was Mars, the father of Mavortius Romulus, that *suo honore* = *geminis cristis* and that *superum* = *divum* = *divino*. See also the more recent literature cited by Norden *ad loc.* and n. 43, below.

<sup>26</sup> Johannes Malalas, *Chron.* 7 (ed. Dindorf, p. 172); Georgios Kedrenos (ed. Bekker, p. 258); *Chronicon Paschale* (ed. Dindorf, I, 204-5); Michael Glykas, *Annales* (ed. Bekker, p. 266), all cited by Alexander Haggerty Krappe, "Notes sur la légende de la fondation de Rome," *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXXV (1933), 146-52, esp. 149. See also J. B. Carter in Roscher's *Lexikon*, IV, 182, s.v. "Romulus."

<sup>27</sup> 11. 105.

<sup>28</sup> *Aen. i. 292-93*. Cf. Ovid *Fast.* iv. 55-56: "placet Ilia Marti / teque parit, gemino luncte Quirine Remo."



*arma Quirini*, as Servius notes and as seems to be accepted by modern commentators. In the other passage, which likewise describes the battle at Actium, Propertius (iv. 6. 21) in all probability uses *Quirinus* as equivalent to *Augustus* in the line: "altera classis erat Teucro damnata Quirino."<sup>29</sup>

Now, in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*, Octavian at Actium is called "Augustus Caesar,"<sup>30</sup>

geminas cui tempora flammæ  
laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice  
sidus [680-81].

From what source did he acquire the *geminas flammæ*? Surely from Romulus-Quirinus; and here two possible explanations may be suggested, each depending on the implication that *geminas* signifies here, as in vi. 779, a dual attribute of Romulus and his twin. It may be that Octavian is to be imagined as wearing a *radiata corona*.<sup>31</sup> Suetonius has narrated how C. Octavius, the father of the future emperor, in a dream beheld his son greater than mortal size and wearing the *insignia* of Jupiter O.M. and a radiate crown: "cum fulmine et sceptro exuvisque Iovis Optimi Maximi ac radiata corona."<sup>32</sup> The interpretation of Vergil's *geminas flammæ* which this tale suggests is supported by Florus; for Julius Caesar, who incidentally "adopted the same manner of dress to which Romulus had been accustomed,"<sup>33</sup> was honored with the

privilege of wearing a *radiis distincta corona* in the theater; and, as Alföldi has remarked, the story, despite Mommsen, is not incredible.<sup>34</sup> It would seem, then, that in Vergil's imagination Octavian at Actium had on his head the *sidus Iulium*,<sup>35</sup> and was also adorned with a radiate crown of the kind which had been affected by Julius, but twofold in order to suggest the two crowns of Romulus and Remus.<sup>36</sup> The imagination of a poet may transcend the visual arts. Vergil elsewhere could speak of a "duplicem gemmis auroque coronam," where James Henry compared "the metaphorical 'duplex corona' of St. Agnes":

duplex corona est praestita martyri:  
intactum ab omni crimine virginal,  
moris deinde gloria liberae

[Prudent. *Peristeph.* 14. 7-9],

"of which the one hoop or circlet is virginity, the other martyrdom."<sup>37</sup>

But, if the idea of a double crown seems incongruous or at all unsuited to *vomunt*,<sup>38</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Scott, "The Identification of Augustus," p. 83, who compares Plut. *Rom.* 26. 2; Dio Cass. xlv. 6 and xliii. 43. 2; Serv. ad *Aen.* vii. 612; Zonaras 7. 8.

<sup>34</sup> Alföldi, *op. cit.*, p. 142; Florus ii. 13 (iv. 2). 91.

<sup>35</sup> For the *sidus Iulium* see Kenneth Scott, "The *Sidus Iulium* and the Apotheosis of Caesar," *CP*, XXXVI (1941), 257-72.

<sup>36</sup> As in the story of Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 276. W. Déonna ("Le Trésor des Fins d'Annecy," *Rev. arch.*, XI [1920], 186) identified Augustus in *Aen.* viii. 680-81 with Apollon-Helios, whose sign was a radiate crown. Such a crown was characteristic also of the Seleucids. This identification, however, does not explain *geminas*. Andrew Runn Anderson ("Heracles and His Successors," *HSCP*, XXXIX [1928], 7-58) suggested: "May not the situation show that just as Augustus inherited the *Caesaris astrum*, so Vergil meant that he should inherit also the horns of Alexander made luminous?" (p. 57), i.e., the ram's horns of Ammon (cf. Gruppe, *RE*, Supplementband III, 986, s.v. "Herakles"). But it is unlikely that Vergil in such a context was referring to Alexander rather than to the Roman precursor of Octavian.

<sup>37</sup> *Aeneidea*, I (London, 1873), 804-5, on *Aen.* i. 655. Cf. Val. Flacc. viii. 235. Prudentius added: "cingit coronis interea Deus / frontem duabus martyris innubae" (*Peristeph.* 119-20).

<sup>38</sup> The incongruity is surpassed in Rutil. Namat. *De reditu suo* l. 115-18, where Roma is urged to be both laureate and radiate as well as turreted, and in

<sup>30</sup> "The Identification of Augustus," pp. 98-99. Incidentally, Jupiter is requested to give way to Augustus earlier in this poem of Propertius (iv. 6. 13-14): "Caesar / dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse vaces."

<sup>31</sup> Whether *Augustus* should be read as an adjective instead of a proper name and whether Vergil, by using it, influenced Octavian's choice of a title, as Warde Fowler conjectured, is outside the argument.

<sup>32</sup> For Augustus wearing the radiate crown see the Marlborough Cameo (Furtwängler, *op. cit.*, III, 317, Fig. 160) and the Beverley Cameo (Georg Lippold, *Gemmen und Kameen des Altertums und der Neuzeit* [Stuttgart, 1922], Pl. LXXII. 3), for which cf. Furtwängler, *op. cit.*, III, 317, n. 2.

<sup>33</sup> *Div. Aug.* 94. 6.

a second and perhaps more likely explanation may be ventured. Octavian on the high stern of his ship may be portrayed not only with the *sidus Iulium*<sup>39</sup> but also with the twin flames, "the religious electricity of the favoured of heaven," as Henry called them,<sup>40</sup> or the St. Elmo's fire of the Roman Dioscuri, Romulus and Remus, one on each of his temples. E. Bethe once wrote: "Erwägenswert scheint die Frage, ob das D.-Paar nicht auch die Verdoppelung des Stadtgründers Romulus-Remus veranlasst habe,"<sup>41</sup> and this is certainly a question which merits further consideration. Vergil was the most daring innovator, as he was the greatest genius, among Roman poets; and it would seem that this gemination of Romulus-Remus symbolized for him the "end of fratricidal wars."<sup>42</sup> Their dual manifestation at Actium on the head of Octavian with the triumphant *sidus Iulium* between them was therefore well timed.

ii) *Verse 780*.—Thanks mainly to Franz Skutsch,<sup>43</sup> who quoted *Ciris* 269: "quem pater ipse deum sceptri donavit honore," Norden altered his earlier view

that the *pater* of *Aen.* vi: 780 was Mars. In his second and third editions of *Aeneid* vi he decided that the *pater ipse superum* must be Jupiter and that it was the father of the gods who honored Romulus with his own scepter. Now the second founder of the city, like the first, was, by implication, a meritorious recipient of Jupiter's attributes. Of the *insignia* mentioned by Suetonius in the story of the dream of C. Octavius, two, and possibly all three, were suggested to the loyal imagination of Vergil. He may or may not have thought of Octavian as wearing the radiate crown at Actium; but in his conclusion to the *Georgics* he predicted the deification of the victor and pictured him in a bold metaphor as wielding Jove's own thunderbolt during his pacification of the East:

Caesar dum magnus ad altum  
fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentis  
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat  
Olympo [iv. 560–62].

Ovid also thought of Jupiter's *fulmen* as wielded by Augustus when, in less happy circumstances, he lamented that his own misfortune was like that of Phaëthon and said of himself:

me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma  
timere:

me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti

[*Trist.* i. 1. 81–82].<sup>44</sup>

The comparison between the heavenly and the earthly ruler is implied in both

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Trist.* i. 3. 11–12: "non aliter stupidi, quam qui Iovis ignibus ictus / vivit." For Ovid's development of the theme of the *fulmen* see Kenneth Scott, "Emperor Worship in Ovid," pp. 53–56, and F. Christ, *Die römische Weltherrschaft in der antiken Dichtung* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938), p. 128. Miss J. M. C. Toynbee has called my attention to the *fulmen* in later art, viz., on the Hague Cameo (Furtwängler, *op. cit.*, Pl. LXVI), where Claudius actually holds it in his hand; and also in the attic reliefs on the city side of Trajan's arch at Beneventum, where the Emperor more modestly appears to hesitate to accept it from Jupiter. See Cook, *op. cit.*, II, 1180, n. 4, and Miss Toynbee's remarks in *JRS*, XXXVI (1946), 181, on the *fulmen* there and elsewhere as a symbol of sovereignty.

Sidon. Apoll. *Carm.* 2. 391–93 (cf. 5. 13–15), where she is laureate, helmeted, and turreted. If Vergil used a poet's license in imagining a double headdress, he at least had more justification than the two later poets. The vivid *vomunt* may imply the exuberant flashing of the rays from the *tempora laeta* of Octavian.

<sup>40</sup> Vergil may have been thinking also of the statue of Julius which Octavian set up in 43 B.C. in the temple of Venus Genetrix, where Julius was represented with the *sidus Iulium* on his head (see Heinen, *op. cit.*, pp. 134, n. 6, and 135, n. 2).

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, III (Dublin, 1889), 769–70. Henry, however, took his interpretation no further.

<sup>42</sup> *RE*, V, 1105, s.v. "Dioskuren." For the Roman Dioscuri see Cook, *op. cit.*, II, 1014. The Greek Dioskouroi, of course, protected mariners (see the passages cited by Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* [2d ed.; Munich, 1912], p. 270, n. 6).

<sup>43</sup> R. S. Conway in his posthumous edition of *Aeneid I* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 66, on l. 292, following Heyne.

<sup>44</sup> *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, II (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), 97–99. Norden also compared *Il.* ix. 98–99: λαὸν ἑσσι δαεῖ, καὶ τοὺς Ζεὺς ἐργυλάειν / σέβειν; Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 6: ἀνὰ σέβειν Διός; and Paus. v. 11. 1.



passages; and here we recollect Cicero's similarly implicit, but less complimentary, comparison between Clodius and Clodia, on the one hand, and Jupiter and Juno on the other: "sed βοῶντιδος nostrae consanguineus non mediocres terrores iacit atque denuntiat,"<sup>45</sup> where Clodius hurls terrible threats instead of thunderbolts!

Accordingly, Norden's explanation of the *honor* which Romulus received from Jupiter is confirmed by Suetonius, for it is the remaining *insigne* which C. Octavius saw in his dream.<sup>46</sup> Vergil, therefore, concluded his four lines about Romulus by implying in verse 779 that Augustus would be the worthy wearer of the *geminae cristae* or double-crested helmet of the deified Quirinus in his dual personality, and in verse 780 that the scepter which the father of the gods conferred on Rome's first founder was likewise destined to be held by a greater than Romulus, namely, Augustus, the vice-regent of Jupiter on earth.

### III. ROMA

en huius, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma  
imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo,  
septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces,  
felix prole virum: qualis Berecynthia mater  
invehitur curru Phrygiæ turrata per urbes,  
laeta deum partu, centum complexa nepotes,  
omnis caelicolas, omnis supera alta tenentis  
[781-87].

Anchises thus proceeds to predict how Roma under the auspices of Romulus will, in Milton's phrase, "bound her reign/ With earth's wide bounds, her glory with the heavens."<sup>47</sup> The comparison prompted by Vergil's imagination is novel and striking. Roma is not merely a personification

of the city with its seven hills surrounded with a wall and therefore suggesting a picture of Cybele's mural crown. The poet's language is precise, and his simile is carefully constructed. Under the auspices of Romulus, she will build that wall for herself around her seven hills, and, just as Cybele is the glad mother of gods ("laeta deum partu"), so she is in her own person the blest mother of heroes ("felix prole virum").<sup>48</sup> Straightway the account of these heroes begins with Caesar, who must be Augustus, and the *gens Iulia*, and the reader is meant to understand that Augustus is the greatest son of Roma.<sup>49</sup> Vergil, as we have seen, had long regarded him as destined to become a god. Here, therefore, he paid him a further compliment, for he compared Roma, the mother of all the heroes of Rome and especially of Augustus, Jove's rep-

<sup>45</sup> The parallelism of these two descriptions convinced Hildebrecht Hommel, "Domina Roma," *Die Antike*, XVIII (1942), 127-58, esp. 135-36, just as it convinced me in *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, CLXXII-CLXXIV (1939), 3-5, that Vergil was thinking of Roma as the counterpart of Cybele; but his valuable paper is concerned mainly and far more fully than mine with the origin of the investiture of Roma with Cybele's mural crown.

<sup>46</sup> See n. 2, above. The mistake of taking "hic Caesar et omnis Iuli / progenies" (789-90) to mean Julius Caesar and the *gens Iulia* deprives the passage of all its point. The poet who goes on to admonish Julius and Pompeius together (826-35) for their responsibility in starting the Civil War could not give the former the place of honor here. (The attitude of Augustus to Julius as reflected in Vergil has been discussed by H. Mattingly, "Virgil's Golden Age: Sixth Aeneid and Fourth Eclogue," *CR*, XLVIII [1934], 161-65, esp. 163; and William M. Green, "Julius Caesar in the Augustan Poets," *CJ*, XXVII [1931-32], 405-11, esp. 407-8.) Though R. S. Conway (*op. cit.*, p. 65) was wrong in following Servius and in refusing to take the "Caesar . . . Iulius" of *Aen.* I. 286-90 as Augustus, he rightly observed of Julius that his "character and conduct were a grave difficulty in the sublime Revelation of Book VI." Lily Ross Taylor (*op. cit.*, p. 175) and others point out that the scene of *Aen.* I. 286-90 cannot be dated before 29 B.C. because of the closing of the temple of Janus. Furthermore, vi. 790 echoes I. 287: "Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astra." The mother's destiny is worthy of her greatest son. Incidentally, it is an easy step from her *felicitas* to his, for which see Alföldi, *op. cit.*, p. 89 and n. 3.

<sup>46</sup> *Att.* II. 23. 3.

<sup>47</sup> It is curious that both H. E. Butler (*op. cit.*) and Sir Frank Fletcher in his later edition of the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* (Oxford, 1941) ignore Norden here.

<sup>48</sup> *f. Paradise Lost*, XII, 370-71.

representative on earth, with Cybele, the parent of the gods and especially of Jupiter.<sup>50</sup>

Whatever the ostensible wishes of Augustus were at the time, Vergil by this comparison made it clear that he had in mind not only the deification of the emperor but also "the canonization of Rome."<sup>51</sup> In 29 B.C. Octavian had sanctioned the cult, first of Dea Roma and Divus Iulius among the Romans of Asia and Bithynia, and then of himself and Dea Roma among the Greeks of Pergamum and Nicomedia.<sup>52</sup> His unwillingness to accept worship, even in the East, except in partnership with Roma, was described thus by Suetonius: "templa quamvis sciret etiam proconsulibus decerni solere, in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit. nam in urbe quidem pertinacissime abstinuit hoc honore."<sup>53</sup> When Vergil was writing *Aeneid* vi, the union of the worship of Augustus and Roma was an accomplished fact in the East, and the emperor's opposition to its celebration in Rome itself did not prevent the poet from hinting at it indirectly. "The fact is," remarks Cyril Bailey, "that the court poets, and Horace perhaps more than Virgil, outran the official pace; they not only supported Au-

gustus in his reforms, in many ways they led the way."<sup>54</sup> Mlle A. M. Guillemin, too, has cited various examples to show that Vergil's intimacy with Augustus sometimes led him to allude to events which only later and gradually came to pass.<sup>55</sup>

Vergil's mention of Cybele was highly appropriate and, indeed, a touch of genius. Originally an Eastern goddess, she reminded his readers that in her former home Augustus and Roma were already deities. However, he had a still more cogent reason for his comparison of the city-goddess with the Berecynian Mother. The plan of the *Aeneid* made it necessary for Juno, the consort of Jupiter, to cherish until the end of the poem unrelenting hatred toward the Trojans, and therefore she was ruled out as the counterpart of Roma in a simile which aimed at equating Augustus with Jupiter. On the other hand, Cybele, the mother of Jupiter, had been the protectress of the Trojan race from time immemorial. Anchises was able to remind Aeneas how their most remote ancestor, Teucer, had come to the Troad from Crete, the cradle of their nation, and how the Mother, too, had left the Cretan for the Phrygian Ida.<sup>56</sup> Elsewhere in the *Aeneid* she appears as the champion of the interests of Troy, for she, as the patroness of Aeneas, had entreated her son, Jupiter, on his behalf when he was building his fleet on Ida.<sup>57</sup> Because she, the Magna Mater, had been the goddess who protected the start of his expedi-

<sup>50</sup> *Aen.* ix. 82-94, cf. Claud. *Bell. Gild.* i. 117-20. Livia, to Ovid at any rate (*Fast.* i. 649-50; *Pont.* iii. 1. 117-18, 145, 164-65), was the earthly Juno (see Gertrude Grether, "Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult," *AJP*, LXVII [1946], 222-52, esp. 228-29; and Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-23).

<sup>51</sup> J. W. Mackall's phrase in his edition, p. xiv.

<sup>52</sup> Dio Cass. ii. 20. 7-8; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 37. For the combination of the worship of Augustus and Roma see A. D. Nock, *Σύνοψις Θεός*, *HSCP*, XLI (1930), 27-29, and in *CAH*, X (1934), 485-86. For the worship of Augustus at Pergamum see W. H. Buckler, "Auguste, Zeus Patroos," *Rev. phil.*, LXI (1935), 177-88, summarized by Cook, *op. cit.*, III, 1191.

<sup>53</sup> *Div. Aug.* 52. For the precedent established by Augustus in reluctance to countenance worship of himself see M. P. Charlesworth, "The Refusal of Divine Honours: An Augustan Formula," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XV (1939), 1-10.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 196. Cf. E. K. Rand, *The Magical Art of Virgil* (Harvard, 1931), p. 99, and *The Building of Eternal Rome* (Harvard, 1943), p. 77, n. 138.

<sup>55</sup> *L'Originalité de Virgile* (Paris, 1931), pp. 16-17. For instance, she quotes J. Carcopino, *Virgile et les origines d'Ostie* (Paris, 1919), p. 728, who mentioned that in *Aeneid* vi. 792 the revival of the secular games is more than merely hinted, although they were not celebrated until two years after Vergil's death. See below, p. 10.

<sup>56</sup> *Aen.* iii. 104-13.

<sup>57</sup> *Aen.* ix. 80-92; cf. vii. 139; x. 156-58.

tion, she was specially venerated by the gens *Iulia*.<sup>58</sup> After the part she played in the *Aeneid* she was fully adopted into the legendary origin of Rome,<sup>59</sup> and after the fire of A.D. 3 Augustus restored her temple on the Palatine, where the infant city was born.<sup>60</sup>

It should be noted here that the art of the succeeding generation seems to have been unaffected by Vergil's hint that Roma might be regarded as the mother of Augustus. Though the artist of the Vienna Cameo agreed with the poet that Augustus could be both the second Romulus and the earthly Jupiter, he ignored the symbolism which is expressed only in the *Aeneid* before the date when he worked. Roma, who is enthroned beside Augustus and wearing a triple-crested helmet, seems to be the consort rather than the mother of the princeps.<sup>61</sup> Augustus, of course, was the *sanctus pater patriae*,<sup>62</sup> but Roma did not play a role in literature as *mater* with the emperor as *pater* until a later period.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>58</sup> H. Graillet, *Le Culte de Cybèle* (Paris, 1912), pp. 109, 111, 347.

<sup>59</sup> Tert. *Apol.* 25: "urbem Romanam ut memoriam Troiani generis adamavit, vernaculi sui scilicet adversus Achivorum arma protecti."

<sup>60</sup> *Mon. Anc.* 4. 8; Ovid *Fast.* iv. 347-48; Platner-Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 324; G. Lugli, *Roma antica: Il centro monumentale* (Rome, 1946), pp. 431-34, 455-56. For the interest of Augustus in the cult of the Magna Mater see Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

<sup>61</sup> The turreted female figure who is crowning him with the oak chaplet is usually regarded as Oecumene or Orbis Terrarum rather than as Cybele, for the figures beside her (Tellus and ? Oceanus) are, of course, personification deities; and she, too, may be the inhabited earth personified rather than a goddess. H. Hommel (*op. cit.*, p. 143 and Pl. 10), however, regards her as Cybele in the guise of Oecumene.

<sup>62</sup> Ovid *Fast.* ii. 127. Cf. *Mon. Anc.* 6. 24-27; Manil. i. 7; Suet. *Div. Aug.* 58.

<sup>63</sup> For "Roma Mater," Christ (*op. cit.*, p. 87) compares Dionys. Perieg. 356: *μνηστὰς πατρὸς τοῦ Ῥωμαίου*; Rutil. Nam. i. 49 and 146; Claud. *Stil.* iii. 150-53; and alludes (p. 89), apropos of Constantinople having been called *Nia* *Ῥώμη*, to the proverb: "ubi imperator, ibi Roma" (Gregorovius, I, 120)—apparently an interesting parody of the presumed formula: "ubi tu Galus, ego Gaia."

#### IV. AUGUSTUS

The historical justification which Vergil may have had in comparing Roma with Cybele and the sequel in literature to this comparison must be described in a subsequent article. It remains here to comment on the following passage in the third or central section of the speech of Anchises:

Augustus Caesar, Divi genus, aurea condet saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva Saturno quondam [792-94].

These lines, which anticipate the secular festival of 17 B.C., are generally understood to mean that Augustus will again found the Golden Age in the land where Saturn reigned formerly. In 40 B.C. or thereabouts Vergil indeed could say "redeunt Saturnia regna";<sup>64</sup> but a little later, presumably, he could speak of Saturn's reign with more detachment when he mentioned it in the sixth *Eclogue* "in close conjunction with the purely Greek legends of Deucalion and Pyrrha and the sufferings of Prometheus."<sup>65</sup> In the *Georgics*, however, the rural life which Vergil praised was lived by Romulus and his twin, when Rome became the fairest object in creation and surrounded her seven hills with a wall. This, too, was the life that golden Saturn lived on earth before Jupiter held the scepter:

hanc olim veteres vitam coluere Sabini,  
hanc Remus et frater, sic fortis Etruria crevit  
scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma,  
septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces.  
ante etiam sceptrum Dictae regis et ante  
impia quam caesis gens est epulata iuvenis,  
aureus hanc vitam in terris Saturnus agebat  
[ii. 532-38].

But in the *Aeneid* Vergil's ambition for the deification of Augustus took a more

<sup>64</sup> *Ecl.* 4. 6.

<sup>65</sup> Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

precise turn. At the beginning of the *Georgics* the poet was uncertain how the divinity of Octavian was to be realized:

tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura  
deorum  
concilia, incertum est, urbisne invisere, Caesar,  
terrarumque velis curam . . . [i. 24-26].

He went on to suggest that Octavian might become, if he liked, a god of the sea or might take his place in a vacant part of the zodiac. But when he came to write the epilogue to the *Georgics*, the verb *fulminat*, as we have seen, shows that his idea of the divinity of the future princeps was being clarified.

In the *Aeneid* it was no great compliment to Augustus merely to suggest a return to the simple life of Romulus and Remus and the peaceful Golden Age of Saturn, as described in the conclusion to the second book of the *Georgics*. The speech of Anchises, as we have seen, implies that Augustus was greater than Romulus and that he was the earthly counterpart of Jupiter. But the commentators on this passage have not usually heeded Ti. Claudius Donatus, who, although he did not see the Augustus-Jupiter equation, yet pointed out at some length in his verbose way that Augustus was to be greater than Saturn because of his travels and conquests:

⟨Vergilius⟩ non adeo laudis inplisset officium, si ea tantum quae Saturnus gesserat facturum Caesarem diceret. quid enim memorabile posset esse, si id fecisse Caesarem diceret quod alius videatur inpluisse qui in sola regnavit Italia? faciet, inquit, Caesar quod Saturnus et eo amplius. . . ecce melior Caesar quam Saturnus; ille enim in sola, ut dictum est, regnavit Italia et meruit habere boni et felicitis rectoris memoriam. quanto meliorem debet habere gloriam Caesar quam Saturnus, qui hanc excedere virtutis et felicitatis merito adseritur posse. . .

Quite so! It was no great compliment to Augustus to say merely that he would restore Saturn's golden reign.

No commentator whom I have consulted has paid due attention to the emphatic *quondam* at the end of the sentence and in juxtaposition with *Saturno*, and only one has attempted to write an adequate note on *condet saecula*. Norden, following H. Usener,<sup>66</sup> pointed out that this phrase seems at first sight to have been used by Vergil in a sense contrary to the original meaning of *condere* in expressions like *condere lustrum* and in Lucr. iii. 1090: "proinde licet quot vis vivendo condere saecula." He remarked: "Der Bedeutungsübergang erklärt sich leicht aus der Vorstellung, dass Augustus, indem er die Vergangenheit zu Grabe trägt, in sakralem Sinn der 'Gründer' einer neuen ist (Augustus als zweiter *conditor urbis*: Suet. Aug. 7)."<sup>67</sup>

More recently the meaning of *saeculum condere* has been illuminated by the comment of Stefan Weinstock that it

im eigentlichen Sinne der sakrale Ausdruck für die Opferhandlung war und erst als Endprodukt einer Entwicklung (s.u.) 'ein Zeitalter gründen' bedeutete. . . Die Tatsache, dass Lukrez und Vergil den Ausdruck ganz verschieden verwenden, insbesondere aber die überraschende Verbindung des *saeculum condere* mit der *ara Tarentini* bei Statius zeigt, dass wir es hier mit keiner (dichterischen) Phrase zu tun haben, die nur auf Grund von Analogie zustande gekommen wäre.—Den inneren Wert von *saeculum condere* erkannte Usener, Rh. Mus. 30, 205 f. = Kl. Schr. IV 117 f. (zustimmend Wissowa S. 431, 3) an; nach ihm ist es sakraler Ausdruck zunächst

<sup>66</sup> "Italische Mythen," Rh. Mus., XXX (1875), 182-229, esp. 206.

<sup>67</sup> He added: "Diese Annahme würde sich mit den wichtigen Darlegungen L. Deubners über *condere lustrum*, Arch. f. Rel. XVI (1913) 127 ff. gut vereinigen lassen: diese hochaltertümliche Phrase ist das Vorbild für *condere saeculum* gewesen."

für die Beisetzung des alten, dann für die Gründung des neuen saeculums.<sup>68</sup>

To the elucidation of Vergil's meaning by Norden and Weinstock it is necessary to add only that Augustus was meant to re-establish the Golden Age, but with the important difference that, as the new ruler and Jupiter's representative, he was to replace Saturn, its king in former times (*quondam*).

The same idea was in Horace's mind in a context where Augustus is described as Jove's second in command:

gens humanae pater atque custos,  
orte Saturno, tibi cura magni  
Caesaris fatis data: tu secundo

Caesare regnes [*Carm.* i. 12. 49-52];

otherwise *orte Saturno* has little point.

Ovid, as usual, appreciated Vergil's hint and amplified it. Near the end of the *Metamorphoses*, in enlarging on sons who were better than their fathers, he came dangerously near to comparing Julius Caesar with Saturn. Although Augustus forbade comparison of his exploits with those of his adopted father ("hic sua praeferri quamquam vetat acta paternis"), the poet did not mind saying that Agamemnon was a better man than Atreus, Theseus than Aegeus, and Achilles than Peleus. Then he proceeded with:

denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,  
sic et Saturnus minor est Iove: Iuppiter arces  
temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis.  
terra sub Augusto est: pater est et rector  
uterque [xv. 857-60].

The flattering ambiguity of *condet saecula* has baffled the commentators on Vergil (except Norden), but it would not have escaped the emperor, for whom it was intended. We are reminded of his reaction many years earlier to another word

which could be used in two contrary meanings, for we learn from a letter written by Decimus Brutus that the young Octavian did not care for the ambiguous sting in the tail of Cicero's remark: "laudandum adolescentem, ornandum, tollendum" and added "se non esse commissurum ut tolli possit."<sup>69</sup>

Vergil made Anchises complete his description of Augustus by saying that neither Hercules nor Liber visited so many lands in their wanderings. Then comes the remark:

et dubitamus adhuc virtutem extendere factis,  
aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?

[806-7.]

Sir Frank Fletcher observes: "The relevance of the lines is not clear. No hesitation on the part of Aeneas and his Trojans has been indicated. The lines read like a topical reproach, put in the mouth of Anchises, to Romans in Virgil's day who shrank from a forward policy."<sup>70</sup> But, as we have seen, Vergil was bringing the conclusion to the second book of the *Georgics* up to date. He was thinking of and revising the lines:

aureus hanc vitam in terris Saturnus agebat:  
necdum etiam audierant inflari classica, necdum

impositos duris crepitare incudibus ensis  
[*Georg.* ii. 538-40].

The way of peace more than ever depended not only on *parcere subiectis* but also on *debellare superbos*. The old reign of Saturn was peaceful, but not so the immediate destiny either of the son of Anchises or of the great descendant who was foreshadowed by Aeneas and who was to inherit the *Saturnia regna* as the earthly Jupiter.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

<sup>68</sup> "Ludi Tarentini und ludi saeculares," *Glotta*, XXI (1933), 140-52, esp. 149 and n. 3. For *condere* = "ein Zeitalter gründen" he added in his footnote: "Vgl. Lucr. III 1090. Verg. Aen. VI 762 (Norden z. St.). Stat. Silv. I 1, 16 f. IV 1, 37."

<sup>69</sup> *Fam.* xi. 20. 1. Cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 62. 6: "hoc est illud tempus quo Cicero insito amore Pompeianarum partium Caesarem laudandum et tollendum censebat, cum aliud diceret aliud intellegi vellet."

<sup>70</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 90-91.



## LUCIUS DOMITIUS DOMITIANUS AUGUSTUS

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

NO ANCIENT writer records the name of Lucius Domitius Domitianus Augustus, who first came to the attention of historians with the discovery of coins issued from the Alexandrian mint dated in his second regnal year. These coins were issued both on the old billon standard of the Alexandrian tetradrachm and on the new imperial pattern of bronze which Diocletian began about A.D. 293. Since Diocletian issued no billon at Alexandria after his twelfth year, it seemed reasonable to suppose that Domitius should be dated somewhere in the transition period, preferably just before the beginning of the Egyptian year on August 29. On the theory that he did not control the Alexandrian mint in time to issue coins of his first regnal year, it was possible for him to have set up the standard of revolt at any time in the preceding year, but he did not have control of Alexandria until August 29, or very shortly before. Very few documents have as yet appeared from Egypt dated by Domitius, but some recent finds have given the clue to the correct chronology and enable us to supplement our meager knowledge of this claimant to the imperial purple.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the history of this period see the study of Diocletian by Costa, *Dizionario epigrafico*, s.v. "Diocletianus"; Besnier, *L'Empire romain de l'avènement des Sévères*, p. 295; Kubitschek, *Sitzungsber. Akad. Wiss. Wien*, CCVIII (1928), I. Abh.; Wicken, *Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1929), No. 1, p. 36; *Cambridge Ancient History*, XII, 277, 355; Seston, *Diocletien*, I, 44; Stein, *Gesch. d. spätrom. Reiches*, I, 174. Besnier and Stein place the revolt of Domitius in the summer of A.D. 295; the others agree on 296. All maintain the identity of Achilleus and Domitius. This identity must be abandoned on the evidence furnished by the Paniscus correspondence (Winter, *Misc. Papyri*, No. 220).

The numismatic evidence for Domitius may be found in the editions of Alexandrian coins by Dattari, Milne, and Vogt. See also Voetter, *Num. Zeitschr.*, IV (1911), 171.

Ancient historians and chronographers name a certain Achilleus who led a revolt in Egypt contemporaneous with the Quinquegentiani in Africa, with Carausius in Britain, and with the war waged against the Persians under Narses. Hieronymus, Eutropius, and Aurelius Victor all agree that these widespread military operations led to the appointment of Constantius and Galerius as Caesars. In fact, Hieronymus mentions two revolts in Egypt, both led by Achilleus, one in the fourth, the other in the thirteenth, year of Diocletian. It is now known that Constantius and Galerius were named Caesars in 292-93, and the chronology of events in Egypt as given by Hieronymus and others must be rejected. The first revolt led by Achilleus has been discarded as fiction, while in the second the chronology has been accepted but Achilleus and Domitius have been regarded as one and the same person. It is due to recent publication of new evidence that this identity must be rejected and the chronology of the reign of Diocletian somewhat modified in regard to events in Egypt.<sup>2</sup>

Under the fourth year of Diocletian, Eusebius-Hieronymus mentions the uprising of Carausius and of the Quinquegentiani and the invasion of the Persians under Narses and says *Achilleus Aegyptum optinuit*. In the following year all this led to the appointment of the Caesars. There is no other evidence that Achilleus

<sup>2</sup> Hieronymus adopted 286 as the date of the accession of Diocletian, but it is generally agreed that this is two years too late (Schwartz, *RE*, VI, 1381; Fotheringham, *Eusebii Canones chronici*, p. xxxi). For the month see D'Accinno, "La Data della salita al trono di Diocleziano," *Riv. di filol.*, XXVI (1948), 244 and bibliography there cited; Ensslin, "Zum dies imperii des Kaisers Diocletian," *Aegyptus*, XXVIII (1948), 178-94.

led a revolt at this time or got possession of Egypt. He evidently did not control Alexandria, for he issued no coins, and thus far no documents have been found bearing his name. In the fourth year of Diocletian the *ἐπιγραφὴ* was instituted.<sup>3</sup> This was a five-year cycle regulating payments for the military annona, but this was probably universal throughout the empire and not limited to Egypt alone. We cannot therefore assume that the *ἐπιγραφὴ* was devised because of revolt in Egypt, nor does it seem reasonable to suppose that this comparatively light tax incited a revolt. There are two inscriptions from 288 which indicate that permanent camps were built at Kantara for a squadron of Thracian cavalry and at Manf-elouth (below Assiut) for the First Augustan Cohort of Lusitanians.<sup>4</sup> It is perhaps significant that no receipts for grain transportation are preserved at Caranis for the year 288. This might be accidental, but, normally, transportation of the crop of the previous year should begin by January, if not earlier.<sup>5</sup> None of this evidence is decisive, though it is not impossible that Hieronymus may record a correct tradition. On this point we must await further evidence.

Hieronymus says that Coptos and Bu-

siris revolted in the eighth year of Diocletian and were destroyed in the ninth year. The coins of the eleventh year of Diocletian indicate the presence of the emperor in Egypt and victories won.<sup>6</sup> In this year we also have evidence of considerable military activity in Upper Egypt. Oxyrhynchus delivered chaff or straw to a corps of one hundred camels at Elephantine to maintain them for fifty-one days; but much larger quantities were delivered to troops stationed at Ptolemais, where there were detachments of the Fourth Flavian, the Seventh and Eleventh Claudians, and a squadron of Spanish cavalry. Among the officers supplied are mentioned a *protector Augusti*, *protector Augustorum*, and an orderly of the *comites*.<sup>7</sup>

Busiris is a common name for Egyptian cities. One of that name is known in the Delta, and another just south of Memphis. It does not seem likely that either of these places would make common cause with Coptos, so far distant, and we should naturally expect these cities to be reasonably close together. Since Maximianopolis seems to have been founded a little to the north of Coptos after the latter was destroyed and Diocletianopolis is probably the new name given to Apollinopolis Parva,<sup>8</sup> it would be natural to suppose that the latter city was called "Busiris" in popular parlance.

In the life of Probus by Vopiscus there is a story that this emperor subdued the Blemmyes and recovered Ptolemais and Coptos from their servitude. The news of this exploit so terrified Narses (293-302) that he forthwith sued for peace.<sup>9</sup> Zo-

<sup>3</sup> The evidence for the *ἐπιγραφὴ* is collected by Amundsen (*O. Oslo.*, 22), to which should be added *O. Mich.*, 802. The cycles of the *epigraphe* instituted by Diocletian ended in 297, and evidently he intended to replace the *epigraphe* by the new indiction cycle.

<sup>4</sup> *CIL*, III, 13576 (Kantara); *ibid.*, 22 = 6620 (Manf-elouth).

<sup>5</sup> For 287 see *O. Mich.*, 411-12. The harvest of the third and second years (usually transported in the following year) is also mentioned in Nos. 409 and 413. It is somewhat surprising to note in *O. Mich.*, 412 (January 25, 287) that *μισθῶνται ἑμβολῆς* evidently contracted for the transport from Caranis. No receipts are dated in 288, but in January, 289, the work of transporting the harvest of the fourth and third years began (*O. Mich.*, 415-19). This evidence might suggest the theory of some disturbance in the early part of 288 when the movement of transport from Caranis to the harbor should begin.

<sup>6</sup> Vogt, *Münzen*, p. 225.

<sup>7</sup> *P. Oxy.*, 43.

<sup>8</sup> *RE*, s.v. "Busiris"; Wilcken, *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, IV (1908), 477.

<sup>9</sup> *SHA Probus* 9. Zosimus (i. 71) seems to be following a fairly accurate source in the main. Zonaras (xii. 31B) seems to put the revolt of Busiris and Coptos early in the reign of Diocletian.



simus, on the other hand, preserves a tradition that Ptolemais revolted under Probus and allied itself with the Blemmyes against Coptos. In this tangle of evidence it is difficult to arrive at the truth. It is possible that Vopiscus has borrowed from the life of Diocletian some episode to fill out his meager sources about the life of Probus. On the face of it, the account of Zosimus does not seem reasonable, but it probably has some germ of truth which is difficult to uncover. The Oxyrhynchus document indicates a concentration of troops in the neighborhood of Ptolemais in the winter of 295. Since Hieronymus places the revolt of Coptos and Busiris in the eighth and ninth years of Diocletian, or in the years 293-94, it is possible to assume that the Oxyrhynchus document either corrects the chronology of Hieronymus and the fall of those cities should be placed a year later or else that this concentration of troops at Ptolemais meant a major effort on the part of Diocletian to settle the problem of the Blemmyes. For reasons given below, it seems better to assume that Diocletian settled the southern boundary at a later time and that in 295 he was presumably concerned in the internal affairs of Egypt, namely, in driving the raiding barbarians out and in quelling the revolt of Busiris and Coptos (or, as Vopiscus puts it, in releasing them from the servitude of the Blemmyes).

The causes of the revolt of these two cities have not been recorded. Coptos was the head of the caravan route to Myos Hormos, and its prosperity depended on keeping this route open. We know too little of the various trade affiliations at this time, but it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Vopiscus has preserved a true tradition that Narses and the Blemmyes were in alliance, and, if so, the merchant princes of Coptos may have decided

to throw in their lot with their former enemies and hence this alliance. It seems inconceivable that two cities, in themselves rather inconsiderable, should have taken up arms against the power of Rome unless they had strong backing. But the Blemmyes proved a broken reed, and Narses was, of course, unable to give any direct aid. Whether he attempted to create a diversion by invading the Empire by way of Syria is unknown. The chronology of the war against Narses seems to depend entirely on establishing the correct chronology for Diocletian.

Hieronymus places a revolt of all Egypt under Achilleus in the thirteenth year of Diocletian. Alexandria was recaptured after a siege of eight months, apparently in the fourteenth year. Throughout the whole country there were proscriptions, and the leaders in the revolt were put to death. Eutropius tells the same story without giving any precise date, but he adds that at this time the emperor put many reforms into effect, which had remained to his day.<sup>10</sup> As we have already mentioned, scholars have usually accepted the year 296 for the revolt of Achilleus-Domitius and have assumed that it ended early in the spring of 297 with the capture of Alexandria.

The evidence from the coins allows some leeway in dating Domitius,<sup>11</sup> but the papyri and ostraca have not been fully evaluated in tracing the course of this revolution. It is well established that the *ἐπιγραφὴ* was a five-year cycle originated

<sup>10</sup> ix. 23. Eutropius implies that Britain was recovered at the same time (after ten years) when Constantius was victorious in Gaul and Maximianus in Africa. After the recovery of Alexandria the story of Galerius and his wars with Narses are related.

<sup>11</sup> Thus Vogt claims that Diocletian began issues of imperial bronze at Alexandria as early as 293. Domitius could therefore be dated at any time after that year, if the date depended on numismatic evidence alone.

by Diocletian, beginning in 287. The first of these ended in 292, and the second in 297. For the last year of the second cycle two payments were made at Caranis for the years 13, 12, and 5 of the emperors and Caesars, the first dated November 9, 296, and the second July 23, 297, and both are said to be for the fifth year of the *epigraphe*. Other documents dated by the thirteenth year of Diocletian show clearly that he was recognized in Egypt in practically every month between those two dates.<sup>12</sup> It may be assumed, therefore, that Domitius was not recognized in that period.

When we turn to the documents dated by Domitius, the most significant for establishing the chronology is an ostrakon from Caranis (*O. Mich.*, 802) dated in November 19 of his second year and recording a payment of wine for the new *epigraphe* (ὑπὲρ τῆς ψηφισθῆσης ἀννώτης νέας ἐπιγραφῆς). Obviously, there could be no new *epigraphe* during the fifth, which had just closed on August 28, 297; and, if Domitius claimed the imperial purple sometime between July 23 and August 29, 297, he did not have control of the Fayum

before the end of July and evidently did not have control of Alexandria or the mint in time to issue coins of his first year. It would appear that Domitius instituted a new cycle for the army supplies, and this would properly begin on August 29, 297, when the previous cycle had closed.<sup>13</sup>

There are few documents dated by Domitius.<sup>14</sup> We know that he was recognized in the Fayum from Thoth 8 to Hathyr 23 of his second year; but a shipment of grain from Caranis in January, 298, is dated by the regnal year of Diocletian, and we may assume that this district had returned to its former allegiance by that time. If we may believe the account that the siege of Alexandria lasted eight months, the final overthrow of the revolutionary elements probably took place in the spring of 298.<sup>15</sup>

It is now definitely established that Achilleus and Domitius are not one and the same person.<sup>16</sup> Achilleus was *corrector*

<sup>12</sup> Since the indiction cycle began in 297, it is likely that Diocletian intended to abandon the *ἐπιγραφὴ*. It was renewed (*via ἐπιγραφῆς*) by Domitius, and it seems unlikely that he began a new cycle of his own anywhere between 287 and 297. No later *epigraphe* is known in the Byzantine period.

<sup>13</sup> The following documents are dated by Domitius (year 2). *P. Cairo Boak*, 26 (*Ét. d. pap.*, Vol. III [1939]) (Thoth 1); *P. Cairo Boak*, 21 (Thoth 8); *P. Thead.*, 26 (Thoth 16); *P. Cairo Boak*, 13 (Phaophi 13 or 23); *O. Mich.*, 802 (Hathyr 23). All these are from the Fayum, and he was recognized there before August 29, when his second regnal year began.

<sup>14</sup> Dating by the regnal years of Diocletian began again at Caranis on January 11, 298 (*O. Mich.*, 180), and shipments of grain had begun at least by June 4 (*O. Mich.*, 909; cf. 907, 908, 910-11; *O. Fay.*, 23), while payments for years 13, 12, and 5 were still being collected in the fifteenth year (*O. Mich.*, 912). At Oxyrhynchus an appointment of an agent to go to Alexandria to look for a runaway slave was made May 11, 298 (*P. Oxy.*, 1643), and evidently travel was once more uninterrupted (cf. *P. Oxy.*, 1704-5; *P. Thead.*, 54).

<sup>15</sup> *P. Cairo Boak*, 21 (*Ét. d. pap.*, III [1939], 86). For the history of the *corrector* in Egypt see C. H. Roberts (*P. Merton*, 26 and Appendix). Theodotus, appointed by Gallienus, is the first known to hold this office in the province. Apparently, Gallienus was the first to separate the civil and military commands when serious fighting demanded the presence of the

<sup>16</sup> Any document bearing the regnal years 13, 12, and 5 (August 29, 296—August 28, 297) shows that Diocletian and his associates were recognized in Egypt during that period in that particular section of the country. The following ostraca are so dated: *O. Oslo.*, 22 (November 6); *O. Mich.*, 900 (13th and 12th years, November 8, 28, December 7, 15); *O. Mich.*, 457 (December 27, 296); 901 (December 30); 902 (January 2); 903? (January 5, 297); 904 (January 6); 905 (January 8); 906 (13th year, March 14), 52 (April 5); *O. Fay.*, 23 (July 10); *O. Mich.*, 179 (July 23). The following papyri are dated in this year. *Jour. Papyrol.*, II (1948), 111 (December, 296; dated by consuls, and regnal year restored); *SB*, 7622 (March 16, 297); *SB*, 7676 (April 9); *PSI*, 1071, is a lease of land for cultivating hay at Oxyrhynchus, and the month is missing, but, according to the usual practice of leases for hay land, it should be dated in June or July. If the panegyric delivered to Constantius (vill., ed. Baehrens) is correctly dated in March, 297, there was peace everywhere (18. 5: "nunc omnis usque ad Maeotidas paludes perpetuis curis vacantes gentes." Cf. vill. 10. 2. Egypt had not been seriously disturbed since Aurelian).

(ἐπανορθωτής) under Domitius.<sup>17</sup> Apparently, he had been appointed *corrector* by Diocletian and joined Domitius when he set up the standard of revolt. Why Achilleus should be the only one whom the ancient writers record as leader must remain uncertain. Possibly Domitius had been eliminated in the earlier stage of the contest, and Achilleus was responsible for the conduct of the bitter defense of Alex-

andria and thus got the credit as the leader of the revolt.

With the new chronology we may gain a clearer perspective of events and thus determine the causes of the revolt. We have the copy of the edict issued in March, 297, by which Diocletian inaugurated his new system of taxation in Egypt, whereby uniform taxation per capita and on land was imposed. This must have been a blow to the privileged classes, who had so long enjoyed lower rates, if not immunity. It may be recalled that Tiberius Julius Alexander had guaranteed immunity to the land of the Alexandrians, and it is well known that Greeks, settled in the Nile Valley and Fayum, not only paid a low tax on their private land as compared with the much higher rents paid for leases of crown and usiac land but also paid a much lower capitation tax than did the native population. These privileges were now to be eliminated, and we may well imagine that Domitius was able to capitalize on the discontent of the Greeks, Romans, and other privileged groups.<sup>18</sup>

According to Vogt, Diocletian had begun to use the Alexandrian mint for issuing imperial currency before 293 at the latest. These imperial coins bear no indication of the regnal year, and it is not easy to establish their chronology. The local Alexandrian billon continued to be issued up to and including the twelfth year (August 30, 295—August 29, 296), but Vogt concludes that he ceased to issue local billon about March, 296, or more than a year before Domitius began his revolt. To what extent the new currency caused discontent may be questioned. The fact that Domitius revived the bil-

governor and he was unable to give his attention to civil duties. Firmus, appointed under Aurelian (P. Merton, 26), may have been *corrector* while Probus was fighting the Blemmyes. The length of Firmus' term is uncertain. The restoration of *OGIS*, 711, might afford a clue. Winter (*op. cit.*, p. 292) shows that the name of Augustus, which was partially erased (not as a *damnatio memoriae*) in line 1, cannot be Aurelian. Since there is no mention of a prefect in the dating, it is possible that the first line should be restored as [ἐπὶ Παύλου, or possibly as [ἐπὶ Ταύρου]. At any rate, Firmus held the office of *corrector* from 274 until the end of the reign of Aurelian and also under one of his successors.

<sup>17</sup> It is not impossible that Achilleus (a not uncommon name) led a revolt early in the reign of Diocletian and that another man of the same name should be appointed *corrector* some years later. The correspondence of Paniscus (Winter, *op. cit.*, No. 220) shows that Achilleus was *corrector* under an unknown prefect (certainly prior to the revolt of Domitius in 297), who seems to be actively engaged in fighting south of Coptos. (His brother-in-law, Hermias, was with the prefect ἐν τῇ περὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἐράδου). Malalas says that all the high Roman officials were massacred when the revolt began (p. 308, Dindorf). Since Hermias was with the prefect on Thoth 12, this letter of Paniscus cannot be dated in 297 but must antedate the revolt by at least a year. It would seem as if Achilleus was appointed by Diocletian as *corrector* while the prefect (Aristius Optatus or his predecessor) was fighting in the south. This may have been in the campaign of 295 or, less likely, in 296. Plutogenia speaks of travel in northern Egypt as if conditions were quite normal, and her visit to Alexandria for eight months was evidently undertaken when the city was not undergoing a siege. Paniscus speaks of the arrival of his nineteen colleagues at Coptos, and the twenty men may have made up a squadron of cavalry.

If Achilleus was appointed *corrector* in charge of civil administration by Diocletian, the administrative reforms which are usually attributed to him had not yet been put into effect. The separation of the civil and the military powers had already been foreshadowed by Gallienus when the prefect, whose civil duties were arduous enough, was compelled to devote his time to fighting. Aurelian followed this precedent in special circumstances, and it remained for Diocletian to adopt it as one of his important administrative reforms.

<sup>18</sup> For taxation in the Roman period see Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt*; for the Byzantine period, West and Johnson, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies, a.s. "Taxation."*

lon when he got control of the mint in 297, while at the same time continuing issues of bronze on the imperial standard, seems to indicate that there was an important element in the country which preferred the old familiar billon, while others evidently realized the commercial advantages of uniform currency even in the subsidiary issues. Domitius evidently tried to please both parties in his compromise, but it seems clear that a strong party, proud of the isolated position of Alexandria in the matter of currency, even if it was worthless billon, preferred the old status and resented the fact that Alexandria had been reduced to the status of a mere provincial mint.

There is very little evidence as to the relation between the two currencies issued by Domitius. A petition dated very early in his reign speaks of a gold piece, or *aureus* (χρυσίον) as worth a mina.<sup>19</sup> The Attic mina was worth 100 drachmae. In this case it is doubtful if Domitius had succeeded in getting his new coinage into circulation in the Fayum early in September (Thoth 8), and presumably the petitioner is speaking in terms of Diocletian's new currency, introduced the year before. This problem I gladly leave on the lap of the numismatists, and I return to the consideration of the causes of the revolt.

The currency reforms may have touched the pride of certain groups, but whether one can speak of "nationalism" in the polyglot population of Alexandria is doubtful, especially in a city where factional strife had become chronic. We are perhaps on firmer ground when we speak of the administrative reforms. It is well

known that Diocletian divided Egypt into three provinces—Jovia, Herculia, and the Thebaid. Eutropius implies pretty clearly that, after the revolt of Alexandria (under Achilleus) was ended, there were widespread confiscations and proscriptions. Following these, many wise reforms were put into effect. It is now apparent that the reform of the coinage was gradual, beginning *ca.* 293, and that the local issues were ended sometime in 295/96. The prefect Aristius Optatus promulgated the edict for the new system of taxation in the spring of 297. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the reorganization of Egypt was designed to go into effect on August 30 of that year, or at the beginning of the new Egyptian year.<sup>20</sup> If so, we may have not only another factor for the cause of the revolt but also some motive for the timing. The peculiar position of *Alexandria ad Aegyptum*, which had been respected by all Roman emperors hitherto, was threatened in the new order. It would no longer be the residence of the prefect and the administrative center of Egypt but would be reduced practically to the status of a nome capital without the privileges and prerogatives of former days. If so, the stubborn resistance of the Alexandrians to the siege is more understandable, and the wisdom of the revolu-

<sup>20</sup> It is doubtful whether Alexandrian coins bearing the legend "Jovius" and "Hercullus" mean anything more than the assumption of these titles by the god-emperors. The provinces Aegyptus Jovia and Herculia must have been the creation of Diocletian, but the office of prefect was not abolished by him. Reinmuth (*Prefects of Egypt*, p. 139) shows that three prefects were appointed by Diocletian after the revolt of Domitius and their powers obviously extended beyond Aegyptus Jovia (Milne, *Egypt*, p. 146). Whether the revolt delayed his plan for reform is uncertain. There is no evidence for a capitation tax in the Byzantine period, although it is obvious that he intended to impose it on the rural population (*Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, p. 259), and that he persisted in imposing a uniform tax on arable land regardless of its accessibility to irrigation seems unlikely (*ibid.*, p. 230).

<sup>19</sup> *P. Cairo Boak*, 21. It is possible that the χρυσίον was a gold ornament weighing a mina, but this would be an unusual way of expressing it. In *P. Oxy.*, 9. v the mina is said to be worth 25 staters or 100 drachmae; as a weight it contained 16 quarters.

tionaries is evident in timing their revolt at the moment of transition, when there would be considerable confusion in the division of civil and military power.

We have already mentioned economic factors in the revolt of Coptos. These same factors were powerful at Alexandria, many of whose industries depended partly on ready access to the Indian market for raw materials and partly on the purchasing power of buyers in the Mediterranean world. The revolutions, barbarian invasions, and general decline of wealth in the West had adversely affected many of these industries. Aurelian is said to have imposed taxes on glass, papyrus, linen, and hemp for the support of Rome. If this is true, the industrial life of Alexandria depending on these products of local origin must have suffered a severe blow. If Lucius Domitius was a merchant-prince of Alexandria, as was Firmus, who led a revolt under Aurelian, he may have represented the discontent of the commercial class, which now culminated in a desperate struggle for independence. The story of the friendly relations between Narses and the Blemmyes as related by Vopiscus during the life of Probus may be more truth than fiction, and it may be recalled that Firmus is said to have had commercial relations with the Blemmyes, Saraceni, and Palmyrenes. It is not impossible that Lucius Domitius planned to build an independent Egypt in co-operation with Narses in Persia, the Saraceni in Arabia, and the Blemmyes and Axumites in southern Egypt and Aden. If so, his revolt may have been timed to coincide with the invasion of Narses.

If the causes of the revolt may be determined in some measure, it is also possible to infer something of the nature of the new kingdom which Domitius proposed to establish. This revolt is said to

have included all Egypt; but, if our analysis of the movement is correct, it was confined to the Greek and Roman residents, of whom the former were the predominant element. The only evidence for taxation under Domitius comes from the ostrakon of Caranis already cited, which recorded a payment of wine *ὕπερ τῆς ψηφισθίσης ἀνώνυμης*. The use of *ψηφίζω* is unusual, and perhaps too much stress should not be laid on a single example. But if the word is correctly used, it would imply that the revolutionary elements had met in some formal deliberative assembly and had decreed an assessment for military expenses in the coming struggle. It would be interesting to know whether this was the last attempt of Hellenism in Egypt to maintain the tradition of democracy. There is no other evidence for taxation, and it is perhaps noteworthy that the receipts for the movement of grain from Caranis to the Nile end on December 30, 296, and do not begin again until May 31, 298, when the revolt was over.<sup>21</sup> However, the receipts also show that Diocletian collected the levy for the thirteenth year of his reign in the fourteenth year, which was normal, but also in the fifteenth year, which perhaps indicates as much the difficulty of finding transport mules as it does the implacable temper of the emperor toward those who had shared in the revolt.

The vengeance of Diocletian is portrayed by John Malalas, who records a tradition that the emperor gave orders to his soldiers on entering the city not to cease from slaughter until the stream of blood rose to the knees of his horse. Fortunately, the horse stumbled on entering

<sup>21</sup> *O. Mich.*, 901 (December 30, 296); *O. Mich.*, 459 (May 31, 298). This long interval may be due to the accident of preservation of records. However, Caranis was not an adherent of Domitius until after July 23, 297 (*O. Mich.*, 901), when the village made a contribution to the military *ἐπιγραφὴ* of Diocletian.



the city and covered his knees with blood. Thereupon, the emperor ordered the soldiers to desist and pardoned the survivors. Eutropius says that proscriptions and confiscations were widespread. If so, this must have affected Alexandrians more than others and, above all, the industrial and commercial classes. The prevalence of crown land in Egypt prevented the development of great private estates, with the possible exception of the Alexandrian *χωρα*, of which very little is known. But it is probable that a death blow was delivered to the industrial life of the city, and the dole granted by Diocletian in 302 testifies to that fact. If we can believe Procopius, the dole continued until abolished by Justinian.<sup>22</sup> To what extent other cities which had shared in the revolt suffered from his vengeance is difficult to determine. The history of the urban communities in the Byzantine period is almost a complete blank, but whether this is due to the policies of Diocletian or to other causes is quite unknown. Diocletian seems to have put through his plan for the reorganization of Egypt, but we have too little evidence as to when this was effective. The imperial currency was made uniform throughout the empire, and Egypt ceased to have an independent system of coinage. Whether he modified his system of taxation is uncertain. There is no evidence for a capitation tax on the rural population in the Byzantine period; and for the tax in kind the slight evidence available seems to point to variations in rate during the fourth century at least. In the sixth century it is evident that the amount of the indiction varied from year to year, al-

though the amount may have been distributed equally per taxable unit throughout the nome.<sup>23</sup>

While the revolt of Lucius Domitius Domitianus may now be definitely settled as occurring between July 23 and August 29, 297, and ending in the capture of Alexandria in the early spring of 298, there remains another campaign in Egypt which may profitably be mentioned here—the final settlement with the Blemmyes. Zonaras mentions an expedition by Diocletian to Ethiopia when Galerius was marching against Narses, but says nothing further about it. Procopius tells us something more. Diocletian abandoned the Dodecaschoenus as far as Elephantine, since it yielded little revenue, and invited the Nobatae (from the Great Oasis) to settle there in the expectation and presumably on the condition that they would protect the southern boundary of Egypt. He adds that Diocletian gave an annual subsidy to the Nobatae and Blemmyes to keep the peace.<sup>24</sup>

The expedition of Diocletian is probably reflected in a document from Hermopolis.<sup>25</sup> This is dated in the month of Thoth, but unfortunately gives no indication of the regnal year. The heading *βρέουιον τῶν ἐκταγέντων ἀνακομισθῆναι εἰδῶν εἰθηνιακῶν* evidently gives the amount of military supplies assessed on Hermopolis. This includes great quantities of wheat, chaff or straw, barley, wine, etc. Of these, the amount of wheat, apparently supplied by Hermopolis alone, would constitute the normal ration for 46,000 men for an entire year. These supplies were delivered to various

<sup>22</sup> Procopius *Anecdota* 36. 40. The date of the granting of the dole is given in the *Chronicon Paschale*. It may be questioned whether Procopius is telling the truth. Justinian provided for the dole in his Edict XIII, and it probably continued until the Arab conquest.

<sup>23</sup> *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, s.v. "Taxation."

<sup>24</sup> Zonaras xii. 31C; Procopius *Hist.* i. 19. 27.

<sup>25</sup> *SPP*, XX, 84.

stations, Maximianopolis, Diocletianopolis, Tentyra, Latonopolis, Apollinopolis, and Ombos. The greater portion of the supplies were apparently delivered. A small quantity is described as *ἀνακομισθηῖναι*. This verb allows two possible interpretations—either that these supplies “had been transported up stream,” which is comparatively rare, or “had been brought back.” If the latter is correct, the war was over, and the surplus war material had been returned early in September.

It is not impossible that this campaign should be identified with that in 295 mentioned above, when Oxyrhynchus supplied tons of chaff or straw to Ptolemais in midwinter and maintained a camel corps at Elephantine for a short time. But Hermopolis supplied nothing to Ptolemais or

Elephantine, and the campaign was obviously over by midsummer. The mention of Diocletianopolis and Maximianopolis as stations supplied by Hermopolis implies a date after these cities had been refounded, but this is the only real clue to the time.<sup>26</sup>

It is quite possible that, after settling affairs in Egypt with the suppression of the revolt of Domitius, Diocletian decided to use his army for a final settlement of the southern boundary. It is probably at the same time that the permanent camps were established in southern Egypt.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

<sup>26</sup> In *P. Oxy.*, 1543, a small quantity of chaff or straw was furnished to troops marching by in the fifteenth and fourteenth years (*P. Oxy.*, 1543; cf. 1572). Whether this can be connected with the southern campaign remains doubtful.



## JULIAN OF ASCALON ON STRABO AND THE STADE

AUBREY DILLER

IN THE *Real-Encyclopädie* there is an article of over a column on one Julian of Ascalon as the author or source of a metrological excerpt of special interest for its citations of Eratosthenes, Posidonius, Strabo, and Xenophon.<sup>1</sup> Another column is devoted to the same excerpt in the article on the stade, for which it is considered primary evidence.<sup>2</sup> In fact, one current theory of the ancient measurements of the earth is based on this evidence.<sup>3</sup>

The attribution of this excerpt to Julian of Ascalon is an error in the text of Harmenopulus' *Hexabiblos* or *Manual of Law* (14th cent.),<sup>4</sup> as was shown by Nicole in 1893, when he discovered and published the source for this part of Harmenopulus' work.<sup>5</sup> Codex Genavensis 23 (14th cent.) contains the *ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον* of the Emperor Leon VI (886-912), followed by a work of Julian of Ascalon on laws and customs in Palestine,<sup>6</sup> both of which were

excerpted by Harmenopulus. The metrological excerpt is not in Julian's work, but a mention of the cubit in the first chapter prompted scribes to enter a scholion on measures in the margin. In the Geneva manuscript a second hand has copied a chapter from Pseudo-Heron's *Geometrica*,<sup>7</sup> while in some manuscripts of Harmenopulus our metrological excerpt has been taken into the text beside the true excerpts from Julian.<sup>8</sup>

The excerpt on measures in the manuscripts and editions of Harmenopulus, containing the citations of Eratosthenes, etc., and falsely ascribed to Julian of Ascalon, unlike the scholion in the Geneva manuscript, is not found in the works of Heron and Pseudo-Heron edited by Heiberg. Viedebantt, through Pernice, found it in codd. Vat. Graec. 852 and 914, but he does not indicate the contents or age of those manuscripts. Long ago Casaubon quoted it from "schedae antiquissimae," "ubi erat fragmentum libri quem scripserat Julianus Architecto, cuius verba etiam Harmenopulus retulit."<sup>9</sup> Although we are insufficiently informed on these sources, they probably signify that the excerpt in question occurs anonymously and rather frequently in later manuscripts. As given in Harmenopulus, the excerpt lacks the last two sections (on the parasang and *schoinos*) found in the other sources.

The original home of this excerpt, including the citations of Eratosthenes and

<sup>1</sup> O. Viedebantt in *RE*, XIX (1917), 17-19; also in *Klio*, XIV (1915), 232-34.

<sup>2</sup> C. F. Lehmann-Haupt in *RE*, VIA (1929), 1936 f.; see also A. Segrè, *Metrologia e circolazione monetaria degli antichi* (1928), pp. 78-80.

<sup>3</sup> H. Nissen, "Die Erdmessung des Eratosthenes," *Rh. Mus.*, LVIII (1903), 231-45, esp. 242, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> G. E. Heimbach, *Constantini Harmenopuli manuale legum sive Hexabiblos* (1851), Lib. II, tit. iv, sec. 12. Heimbach remarks: "In exemplaribus [all-quibus] tota sec. 12 deest. Itaque facile conjectura procedit, totum hunc edictum iam non in libro Juliani fuisse, sed scholii loco ab initio in margine adscriptum, deinde in ipsum libri contextum pervenisse."

<sup>5</sup> Jules Nicole, *Αἰῶνος τοῦ σοφοῦ, τὸ ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον. Texte grec du Genevensis 23, publié pour le premier fois* ("Mémoires de l'institut national genevois," Vol. XVIII (1893)), pp. 69 f.

<sup>6</sup> See H. J. Scheltema, "Nomoi of Julianus of Ascalon," *Symbolae J. Chr. Van Oen dedicatae* (1946).

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, I (1864), 187, tab. 8; J. L. Heiberg, *Heronis Alexandrini opera*, IV (1912), 182, *Geometrica* 4; also V (1914), lxxv, *Geodaisia* 5.

<sup>8</sup> Hultsch, *op. cit.*, p. 200, tab. 16.

<sup>9</sup> Isaac Casaubon, ed. Strabo (1620, also 1587), notes on Strabo 322, 518.

Posidonius, seems to be found in a work published entire for the first time by A. Dain in 1938.<sup>10</sup> It is a Byzantine military treatise preserved only in cod. Laur. 75-6 (parchment, 14th cent.). It is entitled ἐκ τῶν τακτικῶν (or συλλογὴ τακτικῶν) Λέοντος δεσποῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων αυτοκράτορος, ἔτους ιςιβ' (A.D. 903-4). Nevertheless, the authorship is uncertain because of its problematical relation to the well-known *Tacticae constitutiones* of the same Emperor Leon. It is agreed that the two works can scarcely be by the same author. Vári in 1927 showed that the author of the *Sylloge* was contemporary with Leon VI and refers to himself as "emperor" (ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν).<sup>11</sup> Dain in 1931 attributed the work to the eleventh century, but he has since been re-

treating by degrees to Vári's thesis.<sup>12</sup> His reluctance is probably due to two previous compilations, designated by him as *corpus perditum* and *apparatus bellicus*, which were among the sources of the *Sylloge*.<sup>13</sup> We should not expect these to be as early as Leon, although there is no palpable evidence contra. We shall see that still another compilation, Pseudo-Heron's *Geometrica*, is previous to the metrological excerpt itself.

One of the sources of the *Sylloge* was the *Tactica* of Aelian. Dain has recently published a detailed history of this text also. In several manuscripts of it there are three appendices to the main work, the third of which gives the following table of linear measures:<sup>14</sup>

								palm	finger
								4	4
							foot	4	16
					cubit	1½	6	24	
			pace	2½	10	40			
		fathom	4	6	24	96			
		rod	12	10	40	160			
	plethron	10	16	66	100	400	1,600		
stadē	6	60	100	240	400	600	2,400	9,600	
mile	7½	45	450	750	1,800	3,000	4,500	18,000	72,000

A peculiarity of the text of this table, which serves to identify its affiliates, is the form of the fractions: "The pace contains one cubit and one foot," instead of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cubits, as in other tables. Otherwise the table is quite normal, its values being the most usual ones throughout.

The *Sylloge*, chapter 3, gives this same table, but with several alterations which

<sup>10</sup> Alphonse Dain, *Sylloge tacticorum quae olim "in-  
edita Leonis tactica" dicebantur* (Paris, 1938), cap. 3.

<sup>11</sup> R. Vári, "Die sog. Inedita Tactica Leonis," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXVII (1927), 241-70.

<sup>12</sup> *Revue des études anciennes*, XXXIII (1931), 343 (11th cent.); *La Tactique de Nicéphore Ouranos* (1937), p. 64 (10th cent.); *Histoire du texte d'Élien le tacticien* (1946), p. 130 ('un personnage écrivant au nom de Léon VI').

<sup>13</sup> A. Dain, *Le Corpus perditum* (Paris, 1939).

<sup>14</sup> Dain, *Histoire du texte d'Élien le tacticien*, pp. 158-59. The MSS. are Vat. 1164, Paris. 2442, Neapol. IIIC, 26 (11th cent.), and Marc. 516 (14th cent.).

we must examine in detail. In the first place, the last section, on the mile, is replaced by the following:<sup>15</sup> τὸ μίλιον κατὰ μὲν Ἐρατοσθένην καὶ Στράβωνα [322D, Frag. 57] τοὺς ἀκριβεῖς γεωγράφους ἔχει σταδίου ἢ καὶ γ', κατὰ δὲ τὸ νῦν ἐπικρατοῦν ἔθος σταδίου ̅ξ ̅ο', ἥτοι ὀργυιάς Ψ, ἥτοι βήματα ιαϞ, ἥτοι πήχεις ιγ, ὡς εἶναι τὸ νῦν μίλιον ὀργυιῶν μὲν γεωμετρικῶν Ψ, ἀπλῶν δὲ ὀργυιῶν (ω̅μ), αἱ γὰρ ἑκατὸν γεωμετρικαὶ ὀργυιαὶ ἑκατὸν (ιβ̅) ἀπλῶς ἀποτελοῦσιν ὀργυιάς. ὁ παρασάγγης Περσικόν ἐστι μέτρον, οὐ παρὰ πᾶσι δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ δέχεται μέτρον, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς πλείστοις τεσσαρακονταστάδιος ἐστι, παρὰ δὲ Ξενοφῶντι [Anab. ii. 2. 6; v. 5. 4; vii. 8. 26] τριακονταστάδιος, παρ' ἄλλοις δὲ καὶ ἑξηκονταστάδιος, καὶ ἔτι πολλῶ πλείον ἐν ἄλλοις, καθὰ φησι

<sup>18</sup> I have altered Dain's text slightly to conform to other sources of this excerpt when they seem to be more correct.

Στράβων [518C, 804A], προφέρων μάρτυρα τοῦ λόγου τὸν πολυμαθὴ Ποσειδώνιον. ἢ σχοῖνος Ἑλληνικόν ἐστι μέτρον τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ παρασάγγῃ, ποτὲ μὲν τεσσαρακονταστάδιος, ποτὲ δὲ ἑξηκονταστάδιος. It is this text, with its citations of Eratosthenes, Posidonius, Strabo, and Xenophon,<sup>16</sup> that has drawn the attention of scholars to "Julianus of Ascalon." The citations of Xenophon and Strabo are bona fide, the passages being found in their works. But Eratosthenes and Posidonius are lost authors known chiefly from Strabo himself, who is cited simultaneously with them in both cases. It is certain that our author is citing them through Strabo, as, in fact, he states in the case of Posidonius. However, Strabo does not cite either of them in the passages referred to or anywhere else for these data. The citations of Eratosthenes and Posidonius are therefore not bona fide but are rather fictions on the part of our author.<sup>17</sup> As such, they are quite in character; for similar fictions are found elsewhere in the *Sylloge*, where the author manifestly improves on a known source, for example, the name of Sulla in 76. 2; δ αὐτός in 76. 5; Merops in 77. 1; 95. 4, 9; 99. 3; Pompey and Asia in 80. 5; 83. 1; etc. This bad faith on the part of the author of the *Sylloge* seems to show that he is also the author of the fictitious citations in the excerpt on measures in *Sylloge* 3. Eratosthenes, therefore, never said that the mile was 8½ stades, or Posidonius that the parasang was over 60

stades. It is a strange coincidence that, from among Strabo's many authorities, our author chose to attest false stades for the very two whose true stades are of special interest because of their measurements of the earth, Eratosthenes' at 252,000 stades (Strabo 113D, 132A) and Posidonius' at 180,000 (Strabo 95B).

In connection with the mile the author abruptly introduces a distinction between geometric and simple fathoms which seems to be drawn from *Sylloge* 43. 11, where we read that a normal bowshot is about 156 fathoms or 170-80 simple fathoms. "Geometric" may be a reference to Pseudo-Heron's *Geometrica* (see below). The simple fathom, so far as I know, is not mentioned elsewhere. In *Sylloge* 3 the values in simple fathoms are omitted in *fenestris* in the manuscript, and I have supplied them from Harmenopulus. The exact ratio (100:112) is not indicated in *Sylloge* 43. 11; it is nearly equal to the ratio between the variant stades ( $7\frac{1}{2}:8\frac{1}{3}$ ).

Other alterations in *Sylloge* 3 substitute new values for the pace (2 cubits instead of  $1\frac{3}{4}$ ), the fathom (2 paces instead of  $2\frac{3}{4}$ ), and the rod ( $1\frac{1}{2}$  fathoms instead of  $1\frac{3}{4}$ ). The new values of the pace and fathom, which neutralize each other, are found in a table of measures entitled Εὐκλείδου εἰθυμετρικά in Pseudo-Heron's *Geometrica* 22 in the Seraglio manuscript (S, 11th cent.).<sup>18</sup> In the Paris manuscript (C, 14th cent.), this table is replaced by one very similar to the third appendix to Aelian mentioned above.<sup>19</sup> It seems plain that there has been some transfusion between Aelian, Pseudo-Heron, and the *Sylloge* and that the *Sylloge* is secondary to the other two sources, since the new values are not extended throughout its table. The new val-

<sup>16</sup> Strabo and Xenophon are also cited for the parasang and stade in the scholia on Lucian's *Icaromenippus* 1 (ed. Rabe [1906], p. 99), which are probably of about the same age as the *Sylloge*. Both authors ought to have cited Herodotus (II. 6; v. 53) as well as Xenophon for the value of the parasang, as does Agathias (II. 21).

<sup>17</sup> So Viedebantt (see n. 1), and previously Fr. Hultsch, *Griech. und röm. Metrologie* (2d ed., 1882), p. 65, n. 1; and Hugo Berger, *Die geogr. Fragm. des Eratosthenes* (1880), pp. 126, 133. The citation of Posidonius is not included among the fragments of Posidonius by Müller or Jacoby.

<sup>18</sup> Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, p. 197, tab. 14; Heiberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 390-92.

<sup>19</sup> Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, p. 186, tab. 6; Heiberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 390-92.

ue of the rod (6 cubits) is rare in Greek sources<sup>20</sup> but seems to have been original in Babylonian metrics and has consequently been taken as circumstantial for Julian of Ascalon's authorship of this document.<sup>21</sup> Note, however, that  $1\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{2}{3}$  is equal to  $7\frac{1}{2}:8\frac{1}{3}$  (see above).

A new sentence is added at the beginning of the table in *Sylloge* 3: ὁ δάκτυλος πρῶτός ἐστιν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ μὸνὰς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν. This is taken from Pseudo-Heron *Geom.* 4, and it appears also in the table of measures interpolated, as I regard it, in the Paris text of *Geom.* 22 (see above). At one point in the table in *Sylloge* 3 an extraneous unit is interpolated, the *spithamé*. This appears even in the Marcian manuscript of Aelian (see n. 14), but as an obvious interpolation. Both of these alterations appear in still another variant of this table in codd. Paris. Graec. 854 and 1630 (13th–14th cent.), where the *spithamé* is worked in throughout and there are new additions at the end.<sup>22</sup>

We have attempted to trace a much-

quoted and much-worked table of measures through a maze of Byzantine compilation in order to determine the origin of its unique features, viz., the citations of Eratosthenes, Posidonius, Strabo, and Xenophon and the new values of the fathom and the rod. The original form of the table, as well as its earliest occurrence in extant manuscripts (11th cent.), seems to be in the third appendix to Aelian's *Tactica*. The author of the *Sylloge*, writing in the name of Leon VI in A.D. 903–4, took the table from this source, altered it from data in Pseudo-Heron's *Geometrika*, added the partly false citations of Strabo, etc., and put it in his *Sylloge* as chapter 3.<sup>23</sup> It also passed into independent currency, and so into the margin of Julian of Ascalon excerpted by Harmenopulus. Hence the common mistaken attribution of the table to Julian, who probably lived before the Saracen conquest and had nothing to do with this document.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

<sup>20</sup> Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, p. 194, tab. 11; Heron *Definitiones* 131 (Heiberg, *op. cit.*, IV, 86 ff.).

<sup>21</sup> Hultsch, *Griech. und röm. Metrologie*, pp. 384 f., 443 f.; Segrè, *op. cit.*, pp. 114–19.

<sup>22</sup> Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, p. 198, tab. 15.

<sup>23</sup> Vári and Dain still derive this chapter from Julian of Ascalon. There is a metrological passage also in Leon's *Tact.*, *Const.* xvii. 89 (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. CVII, col. 936C): fathom = 6 feet, stade = 100 fathoms, mile =  $7\frac{1}{2}$  stades. Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, p. 201, tab. 17, quotes this passage as from Constantine Porphyrogenetus, through a twist in the tradition brilliantly unraveled by Dain, *La Tactique de Nicéphore Ouranos*.

# ZEIT UND ZWECK DER PSEUDOXENOPHONTISCHEN ATHENAION POLITEIA

ERNST HOHL

**I**N EINEM kurzen, vorsichtigerweise als "Versuch" gekennzeichneten Aufsatz "Zum Rätsel der 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία'"<sup>1</sup> möchte Wilh. Nestle die pseudoxenophontische Schrift vom Staate der Athener keinem anderen als dem Geschichtschreiber des peloponnesischen Krieges, dem Athener Thukydides, zuweisen; damit greift er auf eine dereinst von W. Roscher geäußerte Vermutung zurück; allerdings hatte dieser sein nicht philologischer Vorgänger sich unter Verzicht auf das Wagnis einer Identifizierung damit begnügt, den unbekannten Verfasser des denkwürdigen Elaborats "zu den nächsten Geistesverwandten des Thukydides" zu stellen. Über den hypothetischen Charakter seiner "Attribution," wie die Kunsthistoriker<sup>2</sup> zu sagen pflegen, ist Nestle sich nicht im unklaren. Wir lassen die höchst unwahrscheinliche Vermutung<sup>3</sup> auf sich beruhen und gehen aus von den fünf Feststellungen, die Nestle eingangs trifft,<sup>4</sup> und die er als "erwiesen"<sup>5</sup> betrachtet. Danach war das vielumstrittene Dokument (1) nicht zur Veröffentlichung bestimmt;

(2) richtet es sich an eine einzelne Person; (3) ist es keine Rede; (4) ist es ausserhalb Athens entstanden und (5) vor Brasidas' Zug "nach der Chalkidike"<sup>6</sup> (Hochsommer 424 v. Chr.) abgefasst.

Von diesen fünf Punkten, von denen ich den zweiten, keineswegs allgemein zugestandenem für besonders wichtig halte, vermag ich nur den vierten nicht gutzuheissen. Nestle meint: "Dass er [der Verfasser] seinen Standpunkt ausserhalb Athens genommen hat, beweist der Gebrauch von *αὐτοῦ*," und fährt fort: "Wir haben es also mit einem Brief zu tun oder, wie W. Roscher (*Thukydides*, 1842, S. 538) schon vor 100 Jahren richtig sagte, mit einem 'Sendschreiben' an einen Parteifreund, nur dass dieser nun in Athen zu suchen wäre." Indes erklärt sich der Gebrauch des auf Athen bezüglichen Ortsadverbs im Sinne von "dort" zwanglos aus dem Briefstil: der Schreiber stellt sich auf den Standpunkt des Empfängers.<sup>7</sup> Für jeden unvoreingenommenen Leser müsste es sich eigentlich von selbst verstehen, dass der Text seinem ganzen Tenor nach schlechterdings nicht von auswärts an einen in Athen befindlichen Gesinnungsgenossen gerichtet sein kann; es wäre doch geradezu sinnlos, einen solchen über die Knechtsgestalt des athenischen Kleinbürgers (1. 10) oder über die Verwischung des Stammesgepräges in Sprache, Lebensweise und Tracht der Bevölkerung der internationalen Handelsmetropole Athen (2. 8) eigens zu belehren. Vielmehr muss es sich um einen in Athen von einem Ein-

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes*, LXXVIII (1943), 232-44; Gomme, "The Old Oligarch," *Harvard Stud. Class. Phil.*, Suppl. I (1940), 211-45, ist mir leider nicht zugänglich.

<sup>2</sup> C. Neumann, *Hist. Zeitschr.*, CXLV (1932), 131.

<sup>3</sup> Schon 1913 bemerkte E. Kalinka in seiner grossen kommentierten Ausgabe der pseudoxenophontischen *Athenaion politeia* (Leipzig und Berlin), 21: "... alle Versuche, den Schleier zu heben, der über dem Verfasser der Schrift liegt, schlugen fehl; und ich teile die Überzeugung, dass solche Bemühungen nach der ganzen Sachlage keine Aussicht auf Erfolg haben." "Neuerdings ist das Raten auf einen bestimmten Namen vernünftigerweise aufgegeben worden," meinte 1932 Margot Kupferschmid, *Zur Erklärung der pseudoxenophontischen Athenaion politeia* (Hamburger Diss.), 4, Anm. 1. Dieser Optimismus war verfrüht.

<sup>4</sup> A. a. O., 232 f.

<sup>5</sup> A. a. O., 233.

<sup>6</sup> Lies: "nach Thrakien."

<sup>7</sup> "Vom Standpunkt des Ausländers," s. Kupferschmid's Referat über die Ansicht G. Stalls, a. a. O., 7.



heimischen an Ort und Stelle niedergeschriebenen Brief nach auswärts handeln. Dass der Schreiber ein selbstbewusster athenischer Vollbürger der sozialen Oberschicht und ein in der Wolle gefärbter Oligarch ist, unterliegt nicht dem leisesten Zweifel. Die Einzelperson, an die das Document sich wendet, der Adressat des Briefes, kann nach 1. 11 nirgends anderswo als in Sparta gelebt haben: *ἐν δὲ τῇ Λακεδαίμονι ὁ ἐμὸς δοῦλος σ' ἐδεδοίκει*,<sup>8</sup> "in Lakedaimon fürchtete mein Sklave sich vor dir." Dieses Zeugnis ist wortwörtlich zu nehmen; es gibt eine persönliche Beobachtung wieder, die der Verfasser in Sparta gemacht hat; dort weilte er einstens in Begleitung seines Haussklaven bei dem Gastfreund und Gesinnungsgenossen,<sup>9</sup> dem er nach Jahr und Tag, nachdem in Athen Perikles das demokratische Prinzip zum Sieg über die oligarchische Opposition geführt hatte, einen realistischen Bericht über die dortige Lage in Gestalt dieses Exposés über die heimische Demokratie übermittelte. Das Schriftstück ist also in Athen von einem Athener verfasst und für einen Empfänger in Sparta, für einen Spartiaten, bestimmt; sein Urheber ist zwar ein grundsätzlicher Gegner der Demokratie, aber kein blinder, verbohrtener Reaktionär, sondern ein nüchterner Realpolitiker. Aus seiner Verachtung des Demos als der besitzlosen und ungebildeten Masse und des dürftigen Kleinbürgers, der einem Sklaven zum Verwechseln ähnlich sieht,<sup>10</sup> macht dieser

grosse Herr zwar kein Hehl; aber er bejaht die Seeherrschaft Athens; weil er die Seeherrschaft will, muss er *volens volens* die nationale Demokratie in Kauf nehmen; ist es doch die von ihm verabscheute Verfassungsform, die allein den Fortbestand der Thalassokratie gewährleistet. Mit Fug und Recht hat schon Ed. Meyer<sup>11</sup> dem sich keinen Illusionen hingebenden Politiker im Hinblick auf den imperialistischen Machtstaat der athenischen Demokratie die Einsicht zugeschrieben: "sit ut est aut non sit." Meyer lässt diesen schonungslosen Kritiker auch der "Hoffnung" entsagen, "durch eine Revolution mit Hilfe der widerrechtlich durch Richterspruch ihrer bürgerlichen Rechte Beraubten den Umsturz der Verfassung herbeizuführen."<sup>12</sup> Wenn aber Meyer behauptet, der "Sturz der Demokratie" sei das "Ziel" und die "Verbindung mit dem Landesfeind" der einzige "Weg" zu diesem Ziel und die zwischen den Zeilen zu lesende "nothwendige Konsequenz" der gemachten Ausführungen, so ist mit dieser Unterstellung das klare Bewusstsein des Verfassers unvereinbar, dass Demokratie und Seeherrschaft sich wechselseitig bedingen. Zugestandenermassen ist die Demokratie nun einmal die *condicio sine qua non* der athenischen Seegeltung. Die Verbindung mit Sparta, dem Hort des Konservatismus, dem Gegenpol der radikalen Demokratie, würde nicht nur den Sturz eben dieser Demokratie, sondern auch den Zusammenbruch des auf der Seeherrschaft beruhenden athenischen Reichs herbeiführen. Wie hoffnungslos das Unterfangen ist, die Person des Briefschreibers zu ermitteln, geht aus der Geschichte der Forschung hervor.<sup>13</sup> Alle Möglichkeiten unfruchtbaren Ratens sind nachgerade er-

<sup>8</sup> "In Lakedaimon, wo mein Knecht tatsächlich [von mir gesperrt] sich vor dir fürchtete," übersetzt Kalinka, a.a.O., 69.

<sup>9</sup> Wer mit K. I. Gelzer, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener*, *Hermes*, Einzelschriften 3 (1937), 8, Anm. 1, die mehrfach apostrophierte Person für fingiert erklärt, sperrt sich den Weg zum Verständnis. Vgl. seine Ausführungen 93 ff., besonders 95. Dass im übrigen in der griechischen Literatur die 2. Person sing. oft genug dem deutschen "man" entspricht, ist unbestreitbar. Aber wer will es einem Briefschreiber verwehren, den Adressaten zu duzen?

<sup>10</sup> AP 1. 5; 1. 10.

<sup>11</sup> *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, II (Halle/S., 1899), 402.

<sup>12</sup> A.a.O., 403.

<sup>13</sup> Einen Überblick bietet Kalinka, a.a.O., 17 ff.

schöpft; die durchweg unbefriedigenden Vorschläge erstrecken sich von dem oligarchischen Parteihaupt Thukydides, dem Sohn des Melesias, dem bedeutenden Gegenspieler des Perikles, über den bei Spartolos (429 v. Chr.) gebliebenen Xenophon von Melite, Alkibiades, Kritias, Antiphon und Phrynichos bis zum Historiker Thukydides. Nachdem die Suche nach dem Verfasser sich totgelaufen hat, muss die wichtigere und dringlichere Frage nach der Abfassungszeit klipp und klar beantwortet werden. Wenigstens über den *terminus ante quem* ist eine Einigung erzielt: Roschers einleuchtender Hinweis auf die schlüssige Stelle 2. 5 hat sich durchzusetzen vermocht: die apodiktische Behauptung, es sei einer Landmacht unmöglich, sich von ihrer Basis auf eine Strecke von vielen Tagesmärschen zu entfernen, konnte sich nach dem für Athen so nachteiligen Bravourstück des spartanischen Heerführers Brasidas im Sommer 424 v. Chr. ein zeitgenössischer athenischer Politiker nicht mehr erlauben, vollends nicht einem Landsmann des Wagemutigen gegenüber. Dagegen sind die Ansichten über den *terminus quo* oder auch nur *post quem* nach wie vor geteilt. Und doch ist die zu treffende Entscheidung von höchstem Belang für den Historiker, der eine so einzigartige Primärquelle zu nutzen und zu bewerten bestrebt ist. Gilt das schroffe Urteil, das der Unbekannte von seinem oligarchischen Standpunkt aus über die athenische Demokratie fällt, dem glorreichen Regiment des Perikles oder schreibt dieser Politiker erst nach dem Hingang des unvergleichlichen und von keinem der Nachfahren erreichten Staatsmannes? Schiesst er die Pfeile seiner Kritik gar auf einen Kleon ab? Ist der grosse peloponnesische Krieg schon im Gang oder herrscht äusserlich noch Friede zwischen den beiden griechischen Vormächten Athen und Sparta? Immer

wieder hat man sich auf A. Kirchhoff<sup>14</sup> berufen, der vor über siebzig Jahren in dem auf die Tätigkeit des Rats der Fünfhundert gehenden *Passus βουλευεσθαι: πολλά μὲν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου* (3. 2) den Artikel auf einen dormaligen Kriegszustand und in Verquickung mit weiteren trügerischen Spuren auf die erste Phase des grossen peloponnesischen Kriegs, auf den archidamischen Krieg bezogen wissen wollte. Den nahezu kanonisch gewordenen Ansatz Kirchhoffs (nach Mai 431 und vor Hochsommer 424 v. Chr.)<sup>15</sup> hat H. U. Instinsky<sup>16</sup> einer genauen Nachprüfung unterzogen und als "Fehlschluss" verworfen, um seinerseits die Schrift in die Zeit zwischen 440 und 432 zu setzen, auf jeden Fall also noch vor den Ausbruch des grossen griechischen Bruderkampfes. Im Widerspruch gegen Instinskys Datierung hat K. I. Gelzer<sup>17</sup> sich erneut der Chronologie Kirchhoffs angeschlossen; im übrigen wollte Gelzer die Schrift "möglichst nahe an den Ausbruch des Peloponnesischen Krieges"<sup>18</sup> rücken. Wie er richtig betont, hatte die katastrophale Massenepidemie der sogenannten Pest Athen noch nicht heimgesucht, als Pseudoxenophon schrieb. Wie hätte auch jemand, der die "von Zeus gesandten Krankheiten der Feldfrüchte" (2. 6) erwähnt, deren Folgen eine Seemacht im Gegensatz zu einer

<sup>14</sup> Abh. Berl., 1878, 7 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Bezw. "auf das halbe Jahr vom Ende 425 bis Mitte 424" (Kalinka, 6).

<sup>16</sup> Die Abfassungszeit der Schrift vom Staate der Athener (Freiburger Diss.; Freiberg i. Sa., o. J. [1933]), 30 ff.

<sup>17</sup> A.a.O., 62 ff. Als "entscheidendes Moment" gegen Instinsky führt A. Meder, *Der athenische Demos zur Zeit des Peloponnesischen Krieges im Lichte zeitgenössischer Quellen* (Münchener Diss.; Lengerich i. W., 1938), 166 f. den angeblichen "Einfluss der rhetorischen Lehren der Sophistik" ins Treffen. Aber die AP ist eben kein Erzeugnis der "sophistischen Kunstprosa" (E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I [2. Abdr.; Leipzig und Berlin, 1909], 102). Glaubt man wirklich, dass erst Gorgias im Jahr 427 v. Chr. dem sarkastischen Verfasser der AP die Freude am Wortspiel und an der Antithese beigebracht hat?

<sup>18</sup> A.a.O., 73 f.



Landmacht leicht zu ertragen vermöge, jene über See eingeschleppte Epidemie totschweigen können, von der die griechischen Landstaaten verschont blieben? Gegen Instinskys "Frühdatering" hat auch Gelzers Rezensent H. Diller<sup>19</sup> sich ausgesprochen; ja, Diller hat sich, wenn auch nur mit Vorbehalt, für das Athen des Kleon, nicht für das perikleische als den Unter- und Hintergrund des Ganzen entschieden. Erst neuerdings hat sich E. Rupprecht,<sup>20</sup> der sich früher zu Gelzers Ansatz bekannt hatte, zu Instinskys Datering bekehrt. Inzwischen ist auch H. Frisch<sup>21</sup> für die Abfassung vor Kriegsausbruch eingetreten. Wie Frisch hervorhebt, ergibt der Gebrauch des Artikels an der bewussten Stelle kein sicheres Kriterium im Sinne Kirchhoffs und seiner Anhänger. Der Artikel könne im Griechischen sowohl den "Zustand Krieg" ("Tilstanden Krig") als auch einen "bestimmten Krieg" bezeichnen, was mit Beispielen belegt wird.<sup>22</sup> Dem sei die bislang nicht gemachte Feststellung hinzugefügt, dass das *βουλεύεσθαι πολλὰ μὲν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου* einfach auf das gesamte Kriegs- und Rüstungswesen Athens, soweit der Rat der Fünfhundert dafür zu sorgen hatte, zielt.<sup>23</sup> Mit Massnahmen *περὶ τοῦ πολέμου*, d.h. mit solchen, die das Kriegsressort, das Wehrwesen betreffen, hatte der Rat sich jahraus jahrein zu befassen; gehörte doch schon und gerade im Frieden die Fürsorge für Athens Schlagkraft zu den ständigen Obliegenheiten dieser Behörde. Auch in modernen Staaten gibt es Kriegsministerien nicht erst im Kriegsfall. Dass diese

Beratung "unter den laufenden Geschäften des Rats aufgezählt wird," hat Gelzer gegen Instinsky geltend gemacht,<sup>24</sup> allerdings nur, um aus dieser an sich richtigen Beobachtung den verkehrten Schluss auf einen "gegenwärtigen" Krieg zu ziehen. Wenn laut Plutarch (*Pericl.* 12. 1) die Bündner an den Vorort Athen ihre Bundessteuer, die sogenannten Tribute *πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον* entrichten, so deutet der Artikel nicht etwa auf einen im Gang befindlichen Krieg hin; diese Gelder sind vielmehr für Rüstungszwecke bestimmt. Gegen den in der Volksversammlung erhobenen Vorwurf der Opposition, er verschleudere diese Summen für luxuriöse Bauten, verwahrte sich Perikles mit der Erklärung, der Vorort Athen sei mit dem nötigen Kriegsbedarf zur Genüge versehen: *τῆς πόλεως κατεσκευασμένης ἱκανῶς τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον* (Plut. *Pericl.* 12. 2). Noch nie ist es jemandem beigefallen, aus dem beidesmaligen Gebrauch des Artikels vor dem Wort *πόλεμος* einen gerade im Gang befindlichen Krieg—es müsste ein Perserkrieg sein—zu erschliessen; die Debatte fand ja statt, als durch den von Kallias in Susa geschlossenen Vertrag längst ein *modus vivendi* zwischen dem Grosskönig und Athen vereinbart war, und als Perikles bereits sein grosszügiges Bauprogramm zum Missfallen der von Thukydides, dem Sohn des Melesias, geführten Opposition durchzuführen begonnen hatte. Es ist ein ebenso verbreiteter wie schädlicher Aberglaube, in *Ath. pol.* 3. 2 weise der Artikel vor *πόλεμος* auf den archidamischen Krieg hin; wer diesem Aberglauben huldigt, scheint völlig vergessen zu haben, dass seit Kriegsbeginn in der Festung Athen der Ausnahmezustand herrschte und dass Perikles über ausserordentliche Vollmachten verfügte.<sup>25</sup> Will

<sup>19</sup> *Gnomon*, XV (1939), 113 ff.

<sup>20</sup> *Gnomon*, XVIII (1942), 2 f.

<sup>21</sup> *Athenernes Statsforfatning: En filologisk-historisk Analyse af Pseudo-Xenofons Skrift De republica Atheniensium* (Kopenhagen, 1941), 51 (= *The Constitution of the Athenians* [Copenhagen, 1942], p. 62).

<sup>22</sup> A.a.O., 43 (= *Const. of the Aths.*, p. 53).

<sup>23</sup> J. Oehler gibt *RE*, III (1899), 1031 diese Stelle in aller Unbefangenheit als einzigen Beleg dafür, dass der Rat "für die Kriegstüchtigkeit des Staates sorgte."

<sup>24</sup> A.a.O., 65.

<sup>25</sup> G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, III, 1 (Gotha, 1897), 498 f.; III, 2 (1904), 917, Anm. 3; 930.

man etwa die von dem Oberstrategen Perikles zu treffenden strategischen und taktischen Massnahmen der Kriegführung zu den "laufenden Geschäften des Rats" zählen? Das kommt doch ernsthaft nicht in Frage. So hoffe ich denn, mit triftiger Begründung als es bisher geschehen ist, die angebliche Anspielung auf den archidamischen Krieg als irreführendes Vorurteil erwiesen zu haben. Es ist ein nicht unbedenkliches Zugeständnis an Kirchhoffs verfehlte Interpretation, wenn Instinsky schliesslich doch noch die Möglichkeit einer Anspielung auf einen "bestehenden Kriegszustand," nämlich auf den samischen Aufstand (440–437) in Erwägung zieht.<sup>26</sup> Die "diktatorische Machtvollkommenheit,"<sup>27</sup> mit der Perikles während des Kriegs bekleidet war, ist eine geschichtliche Realität, die Pseudoxenophon nicht hätte ignorieren können, falls er erst nach Ausbruch des peloponnesischen Kriegs zum Schreibrohr gegriffen hätte. Dass er aber von den mannigfachen Aufgaben des Rats gerade das Kriegsresort voranstellt, erklärt sich aus dem besonderen Interesse, das er selbst diesem Gebiet entgegenbringt und das er auch bei seinem spartiatischen Korrespondenten voraussetzen darf.

Die Schrift ist also—darüber sind sich sämtliche neueren Beurteiler einig—auf jeden Fall vor dem Zug des Brasidas (Sommer 424 v. Chr.) entstanden. Schon durch die Erkenntnis, dass es sich um einen Brief handelt, den ein Athener aus Athen an einen Spartaner richtet, wird die Abfassung nach dem Ausbruch des grossen peloponnesischen Krieges praktisch ausgeschlossen. Unter den Gebieten, deren Erzeugnisse nach der Handelsmetro-

pole Athen eingeführt werden, ist auch der Peloponnes genannt (2. 7); statt an der damit unvereinbaren Datierung Kirchhoffs irre zu werden, versieht Kalinka<sup>28</sup> diese Notiz mit folgender nicht eben geistreicher Glosse: "Immerhin wirft es ein Streiflicht auf die Gesinnung der athenischen Oligarchen, dass selbst inmitten erbitterter Kämpfe Athens mit den Peloponnesiern anerkannt wird, dass auch von dort wertvolle Genussmittel zu beziehen sind."<sup>29</sup> Wir werden von vornherein darauf verzichten müssen, den genauen Zeitpunkt der Abfassung, den *terminus quo* zu ermitteln, uns vielmehr mit einem blossen *terminus post quem* zu bescheiden haben. Vorausgesetzt ist an der soeben genannten Stelle (2. 7) ein friedlicher Handelsverkehr Athens mit Ländern des persischen Reichs (Zypern, Ägypten, Lydien, Pontus) und mit dem Peloponnes, mit anderen Worten der Kalliasvertrag vom Jahr 448 und der im Jahr 446 mit Sparta auf dreissig Jahre geschlossene Friede, dem aber der Ausbruch des archidamischen Kriegs nach knapp fünfzehnjähriger Dauer ein vorzeitiges Ende bereiten sollte.

Wesentlicher als diese allgemeinen Fixpunkte, wie sie sich aus der Aussen- und Handelspolitik des perikleischen Athens ergeben, ist der einheitliche innenpolitische Aspekt dieses einzigartigen Beitrags zur Naturgeschichte der griechischen Demokratie; schon Gelzer<sup>30</sup> hat die gewiss nicht müssige Frage aufgeworfen, wann sich eigentlich nach Pseudoxenophons Ansicht die Athener für den von

<sup>26</sup> A. a. O., 198.

<sup>27</sup> A. a. O., 34: "Ist die Schrift aber zwischen 440 und 437 geschrieben, so ist hier [3. 2] der samische Aufstand gemeint. Damit wäre auch der Meinung derer Rechnung getragen, die glauben, hier könne nur von einem bestehenden Kriegszustand die Rede sein."

<sup>28</sup> K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, II, 1 (2. Aufl.; Strassburg, 1914), 306.

<sup>29</sup> Die Gedankenlosigkeit, das Zusammenströmen "fremder, namentlich lakadalmonischer Gäste" in Athen anlässlich der "grossen Feste, besonders der Dionysien"—NB mitten im Kriege!—vorauszusetzen (Kalinka, 58), hat schon Kupferschmid, 10 beanstandet. Kalinka setzt ja die AP, die er als die Nachschrift einer Stegreifrede aus dem Geist der Sophistik seltsam missdeutet, in die Zeit des archidamischen Kriegs.

<sup>30</sup> A. a. O., 81.

ihm kritisierten und analysierten jetzigen *τρόπος τῆς πολιτείας*,<sup>31</sup> nämlich für die unbeschränkte unmittelbare Demokratie entschieden haben. Unter Berufung auf Aristoteles' *Athenaion politeia* 41. 2 gibt er die Antwort: im Jahr 461<sup>32</sup> mit der Entmachtung des Areopags. In Ablehnung dieser Antwort könnte man die nämliche Schrift des Aristoteles zitieren: c. 28 bringt einen Katalog der Häupter der beiden Parteien, die sich im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts gegenüberstanden; da werden nach dem Demokratenführer Ephialtes und seinem Gegner Kimon, dem Exponenten der Gutsituierter (*εὖποροι*), als nächstes feindliches Paar Perikles und Thukydides konfrontiert. Jahrelang haben diese beiden Politiker erbittert miteinander um die Macht im Staat gerungen. Kimons Nachfolger und Schwiegersohn Thukydides hat die Opposition gegen die in Perikles verkörperte radikale Demokratie in der von ihm beherrschten oligarchischen Partei organisiert.<sup>33</sup> Seine Kritik kehrte sich gegen Perikles' kostspieliges Bauprogramm sowie gegen dessen Finanzierung aus den von den Mitgliedern des Seebundes entrichteten Tributen. Als Anwalt der Bündner wider setzte er sich der imperialistischen Tendenz der athenischen Demokratie, der Umwandlung des Bundes in ein athenisches Reich. Wahrscheinlich im Jahr 443<sup>34</sup> bot das Scherbengericht den Athenern die Gelegenheit, zwischen den beiden Rivalen zu entscheiden. Es zeigte sich, dass Perikles die Mehrheit der Abstimmenden hinter sich hatte; so fiel die Entscheidung gegen Thukydides aus, der sich genötigt

sah, auf ein Jahrzehnt in die Verbannung zu ziehen. Dieser Ostrakismos war mehr als nur eine personelle Angelegenheit; es ging letzten Endes um den gesamten innen- wie aussenpolitischen Kurs in Athen. In ihrem Führer Thukydides war die oligarchische Opposition gegen das von Perikles vertretene extrem demokratische Prinzip aufs schwerste getroffen. Perikles, aus dem "innerpolitischen Duell"<sup>35</sup> als Sieger hervorgegangen, hat nicht gezögert, die Gegenpartei zu zerschlagen<sup>36</sup> und die Opposition mundtot zu machen. Die Athener, die ihren Mitbürger Thukydides ins Exil schickten, gaben ihre Scherben gegen eine konservativ-oligarchische Restauration und für die radikale Demokratie ab. Mit diesem bedeutsamen Volksscheid haben sie tatsächlich "diese ihre Staatsform gewählt," *εἰλοντο τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον*, wie der Anonymus sich im Eingang seines Schreibens auszudrücken beliebt. Kein Zweifel, der Ostrakismos des Jahres 443 ist in innenpolitischer Hinsicht der *terminus post quem* für die Entstehung des oligarchischen Exposés über die in Athen zur Alleinherrschaft gelangte Demokratie. Die innere und die äussere Geschichte Athens hätte einen anderen Verlauf genommen, wenn damals nicht Thukydides, sondern, wie die Oligarchen hofften, Perikles ausgebootet worden wäre. Der Briefschreiber ist einer der alten Parteigenossen des verbannten Thukydides. Er schreibt nach und zwar vermutlich bald nach dem Sturz dieses geistig und sittlich hochstehenden, seines grossen Gegners würdigen Politikers.<sup>37</sup> Die Resig-

<sup>31</sup> H. Schaefer, *Hermes*, LXXIV (1939), 258.

<sup>32</sup> Plut. *Per.* 14. 3.

<sup>33</sup> M. Volkening, *Das Bild des Staates in der pseudoxenophontischen Schrift vom Staate der Athener* (Münsterer Diss.; Minden, 1940), 7 will "mit dem zeitlichen Ansatz der AP nicht unter das Todesjahr des Perikles hinuntergehen," und zeigt sich S. 47 nicht abgeneigt, die "Schrift nicht allzulange nach dem Ostrakismos des Oligarchenführers Thukydides anzusetzen." Richtig ausgewertet hat er dieses *Aperçu* nicht.

<sup>34</sup> AP 1. 1.

<sup>35</sup> Lies: 462. Zur Chronologie s. Busolt, a.a.O., III, 1, 259 f., Anm.

<sup>36</sup> Plutarch *Pericl.* 11. 2; Busolt, III, 1, 443.

<sup>37</sup> Für 443 entschied sich Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, IV, 1 (3. Aufl.; Stuttgart, 1939), 693, 1; für 445 Beloch, a.a.O., 185, 1; für 442 Busolt, III, 1, 495, 1.

nation, von der seine Ausführungen getragen sind,<sup>38</sup> erklärt sich aus der hoffnungslosen Lage, in die sich die antidemokratische und antiperikleische Opposition durch ihre Niederlage versetzt sah.

Dass der Anonymus sich mit seinem allgemein gehaltenen, aber äusserst heftigen Ausfall gegen etliche Renegaten, die sich trotz ihres nicht plebejischen Naturells zum Volke halten (2. 19 f.), gegen Perikles wendet, haben schon J. Bernays und A. v. Gutschmid erkannt.<sup>39</sup> Kalinka schränkt seine Zustimmung zu der Annahme einer aktuellen Anspielung auf Perikles durch die Behauptung ein, es handle sich "nur um den allgemeinen Typus des adeligen Volksführers."<sup>40</sup> Indes gehört der Hang zum Verallgemeinern zu den Eigentümlichkeiten der *AP*; er verleiht ihr das theoretische Gepräge, das man seit R. Schölls bekannter Festrede<sup>41</sup> immer wieder als "wissenschaftlichen" Grundzug angesprochen hat. Ich glaube, man hat bei den *ἐνιοὶ τὴν φύσιν οὐ δημοτικοί*<sup>41a</sup> an den Kreis zu denken, dessen Mittelpunkt Perikles war, einen Kreis, in den auch Geistesaristokraten wie der Tragiker Sophokles, der Sohn eines reichen Fabrikanten, eingetreten waren.<sup>42</sup> Von vornherein ausgeschlossen ist durch unsere Datierung die Beziehung auf einen Alkibiades;<sup>43</sup> ge-

gen den höchst unglücklichen Einfall, der Demagog Kleon, der reiche Parvenü, sei gemeint, hat schon Gelzer<sup>44</sup> das Nötige gesagt. Der Hass hat den Blick des Verfassers teils unheimlich geschärft, teils in bedauerlicher Weise getrübt: er erkennt alle Auswüchse des ihm widerwärtigen, aber auch so folgerichtigen demokratischen Systems, verkennt aber die staatsmännische Grösse des Perikles, den er, ohne ihn zu nennen, als abtrünnigen Standesgenossen verunglimpft, indem er ihm und seinesgleichen unlautere Beweggründe unterstellt (2. 20). Nicht einmal für die wahrhaft grossartige Kulturpolitik, die den unvergänglichen Ruhm der perikleischen Ära ausmacht, hat er ein Wörtlein übrig.<sup>45</sup> Er pocht auf das nicht mehr zeitgemässe Bildungsmonopol der reichen Oberschicht und blickt verächtlich herunter auf die ungebildete Masse des Volks (1. 5). Jeden sozialen Empfindens bar, ärgert sich dieser "Junker" über die materiellen Vorteile, deren sich in dem demokratisierten Athen der Pöbel (*ὄχλος*) zu erfreuen hat (2. 7, 9 f.). Die volkserzieherischen Absichten des Perikles liegen ihm ganz fern.

Das für den Historiker interessanteste Stück des interessanten Textes sind doch wohl die Paragraphen 14 bis 16 des 2. Kapitels. Hier geht Pseudoxenophon mit Sachkenntnis auf die Nachteile ein, die den seemächtigen Athenern daraus erwachsen, dass sie keine Inselbewohner sind, sowie auf die Massnahmen, die sie gegebenenfalls ergreifen, um diese Nachteile einigermaßen auszugleichen. Durch die mangelnde Insellage sehen sie sich veranlasst, zu Land sich auf die Defensive zu beschränken, die Landschaft Attika zu räumen und der Verheerung durch den Feind preiszugeben. Kirchhoff und seine Anhänger sehen in diesen Ausführungen

<sup>38</sup> Von "Resignation" spricht U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I (Berlin, 1893), 171, Anm. 72, dessen Auffassung, dass die Schrift bald nach Perikles' Tod an die stürmische Jugend der oligarchischen Partei Athens gerichtet sei, ich mir nicht aneignen vermag.

<sup>39</sup> Siehe Kalinka, a.a.O., 250 ff., dessen Interpretation ich mit Gelzer, 32, 1 gegen Diller, 118 und Kupferschmid, 49, 3 zustimme.

<sup>40</sup> A.a.O., 252.

<sup>41</sup> *Die Anfänge einer politischen Literatur bei den Griechen* (München, 1890).

<sup>41a</sup> Als frühes Zeugnis über Sokrates ausgedeutet von Diller, 118 (im Anschluss an E. Kapp), anerkannt von B. Snell, *Philologus*, XCVII (1948), 125 f.

<sup>42</sup> Vgl. Ed. Meyer, *G.d.A.*, IV, 1, 696.

<sup>43</sup> Nestle, 233 f., 237. Für diesen Gelehrten, der in Thukydides den Verfasser der *AP* erkennen möchte, ist die Beziehung auf den im Geschichtswerk gefeierten "Princeps" von Athen allerdings eine bare Unmöglichkeit.

<sup>44</sup> A.a.O., 89 f.

<sup>45</sup> Vgl. Volkening, 37 f.

einen unverkennbaren und eindeutigen Hinweis auf den archidamischen Krieg, auf die Einfälle oder zum mindesten auf den ersten Einfall, den das von König Archidamos von Sparta befehligte peloponnesische Bundesaufgebot im Frühjahr 431 v. Chr. nach Attika unternommen hat. Demgegenüber hat Instinsky<sup>46</sup> den rein theoretischen Charakter des ganzen Abschnitts verfochten. Er hat auch schon daran erinnert, dass das "Prinzip" einer Strategie, die das flache Land aufopfert und Hab und Gut der Bewohner auf den Inseln birgt, bereits im Perserkrieg angewandt worden war. Nur dass damals auch die Stadt Athen, die noch nicht zur starken Festung ausgebaut war, zweimal geräumt werden musste.<sup>47</sup> Gelzers Polemik<sup>48</sup> gegen Instinskys Interpretation schlägt nicht durch. Als besonders wichtige Konsequenz des hier vertretenen zeitlichen Ansatzes der AP dürfen wir die nur zu oft verkannte Tatsache buchen, dass die sogenannte Strategie des Perikles bereits lange vor dem Ausbruch des grossen peloponnesischen Kriegs ein offenes Geheimnis war, dass jedenfalls der kriegstheoretisch interessierte, sachverständige Verfasser diese Strategie für eine Selbstverständlichkeit hielt.<sup>49</sup> Den strategischen Grundgedanken hatte ja schon in den siebziger Jahren Themistokles, der Sieger von Salamis, seinen Landsleuten wiederholt eingeschärft (Thuc. I. 93. 6 f.). Allerdings gehörte im Ernstfall die Autorität eines Perikles dazu, der gesamten Bürgerschaft, einschliesslich des unmittelbar betroffenen Landvolkes, das in der Festung

Athen auf ungewisse Zeit Notquartier beziehen musste, diese Art der Kriegführung plausibel zu machen. Im übrigen ist die entgegengesetzte aussenpolitische Einstellung der Bauernschaft und der reichen Grundbesitzer auf der einen und des grossstädtischen Demos auf der anderen Seite scharf umrissen: die agrarischen Elemente, die genau wissen, dass sie im Kriegsfall die Leidtragenden wären und die Zeche zu bezahlen hätten, scheuen sich vor kriegerischen Verwicklungen, während das Stadtvolk, dem die das Land verheerenden, sengenden und brennenden Feinde nichts anhaben können, unbekümmert in den Tag hineinlebt (2. 14). Es sind ja nicht seine Wohnstätten, die in Flammen aufgehen, nicht seine Fluren die verheert werden, wenn es zu einem feindlichen Einfall kommt. Überhaupt wirft Pseudoxenophon der Aussenpolitik des souveränen athenischen Volkes Skrupellosigkeit und mangelnde Vertragstreue vor (2. 17). Die Erinnerung an hoch- und landesverräterische Absichten, die im Jahr 457 v. Chr. von Gegnern der Demokratie gehegt wurden, hat sich in 2. 15 niedergeschlagen, wo die theoretisch dem Demos drohende Gefahr eines mit Hilfe des äusseren Feindes unternommenen Umsturzes an die Wand gemalt wird. Damals hatte es nach Thukydides' Bericht in Athen Männer gegeben, die in der Hoffnung, die Demokratie stürzen und den Bau der langen Mauern hindern zu können, mit dem spartanischen Regenten Nikomedes, der in Böotien an der Spitze eines Heeres stand, konspirierten.<sup>50</sup> Gegen die für manchen unwiderstehliche Versuchung, aus jenem Passus der AP einen Aufruf zur oligarchischen Revolution und die Aufforderung zum Hoch- und Landesverrat herauszulesen, ist gefeit, wer das Dokument einfach als einen Brief

<sup>46</sup> A.A.O., 14.

<sup>47</sup> Herodot. VIII. 41; Ed. Meyer, *G.d.A.*, IV, 1, 363 f.; Busolt, II, 292; Herodot. IX. 5; Meyer, 382 f.; Busolt, 721.

<sup>48</sup> A.A.O., 69 f.

<sup>49</sup> Treffend bemerkt Volkening, 6: "... so wenig der bekannte Schlieffenplan erst zu Beginn des Weltkrieges aufgestellt worden ist ... so wenig ist das perikleische Programm eine Schöpfung des Jahres 431 gewesen."

<sup>50</sup> Thuc. I. 107. 4; vgl. Busolt, III, 1, 312, 5; Meyer, *G.d.A.*, IV, 1, 559; s. auch Kalinka, 230.



nimmt, der mitten im Frieden mit der konservativen Hochburg Sparta entstanden ist. Die schlichte Annahme, dass wir einen solchen vor uns haben und zwar nicht etwa einen offenen, sondern einen privaten Brief, den ein athenischer Oligarch an einen ihm befreundeten Spartiaten gerichtet hat, bringt auch die viel erörterte und so verschieden beantwortete Frage nach dem Zweck des Ganzen zu einer glatten Lösung. Unbefangener und vorurteilsloser Betrachtung erscheint das Schriftstück nicht als ein literarisches Erzeugnis, sondern als ein nicht zur Veröffentlichung und Weiterverbreitung bestimmter Originalbericht; sein temperamentvoller Verfasser will den Empfänger über die gesamte politische Lage informieren wie sie sich am Ilissos durch den im Jahr 443 errungenen endgültigen Sieg der perikleischen Demokratie gestaltet hatte. Die sogenannte *Athenaion politeia* ist weder ein "Pamphlet"<sup>51</sup> noch eine wissenschaftlich-theoretische Studie. Aber sie weist allerdings Züge auf, die teils zu dieser, teils zu jener Gattung passen würden. Was uns vorliegt, mutet wie die schriftliche Wiederaufnahme des politischen Gesprächs an, das vor Jahr und Tag der Briefschreiber mit seinem Gastfreund geführt haben mag. Der Berichterstatte wird ursprünglich einer der ehrlichen Lakonisten vom Schlage Kimons gewesen sein. Aber der kimonische Traum eines friedlichen Dualismus, eines harmonischen Zusammenwirkens von Sparta und Athen zum Heile Griechenlands ist für immer ausgeträumt. In Hinblick auf das Fiasko, das der Idealist Kimon und mit ihm die athenische Oligarchie im Jahr 462 während des dritten messenischen Kriegs erlitten hatte, als die undankbaren Spartaner das athe-

nische Hilfskorps sang- und klanglos heimschickten, erklärt Pseudoxenophon unverblümt, dass man für die Messenier statt für die Spartaner hätte Partei ergreifen sollen (3. 11).

Das dem Briefschreiber und dem Briefempfänger gemeinsame politische Ideal ist die Eumonie, als deren Verwirklichung der spartanische Musterstaat gilt. Der Athener macht dem Spartaner klar, dass die Demokratie in Athen fest im Sattel sitzt und sich aus dem Vorwurf der *κακονομία* (1. 8)—dieser drastische Gegenbegriff zu *εὐνομία* kommt nur an dieser einzigen Stelle vor—nicht das Geringste macht. Das Wort "Demokratie" ist im oligarchischen Parteijargon gleichbedeutend mit Ochlokratie.<sup>52</sup> Erst die Zeit des Perikles oder gar der grosse Staatsmann selbst scheint das Wort aus einem gegnerischen Schlag- und Schimpfwort im Hochgefühl des Erfolgs als vollgültigen Ersatz der älteren Bezeichnung Isonomie in einen offiziellen staatsrechtlichen Begriff umgeprägt zu haben.<sup>53</sup>

Allem Anschein nach ist der Verfasser der AP kein Konservativer des alten Schlags, kein "Agrarier," sondern ein Mitglied der am Überseehandel und damit an der Seeherrschaft interessierten kaufmännisch-industriellen Plutokratie. Man hat an einen Schiffsreeder gedacht.<sup>54</sup> Was Pseudoxenophon über die Last der Liturgien sagt (1. 13), dürfte auf eigener Erfahrung beruhen; er mag Trierarch, vielleicht auch Strateges gewesen sein,<sup>55</sup> besitzt auf jeden Fall militärische und nautische Sachkenntnis. Die mehrfach beobachtete

<sup>51</sup> Vgl. Volkening, 22.

<sup>52</sup> Thuc. II. 37. 1; vgl. M. Pohlenz, *Staatsgedanke und Staatslehre der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1923), 47 f. S. Jetzt J. A. O. Larsen, "Cleisthenes and the Development of the Theory of Democracy at Athens," *Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1948), 13 f.

<sup>53</sup> Vgl. Nestle, 241.

<sup>54</sup> Frisch, 79 (= *Const. of the Aths.*, p. 90).

<sup>51</sup> Oder eine "Broschüre," wie Meyer, *G.d.A.*, IV, 1, 707 sagt. Gegen die beliebte und verbreitete Bezeichnung als "Pamphlet" wandte sich schon Gelzer, 83, 2.

Zwiespältigkeit<sup>56</sup> seiner Haltung dem Phänomen der athenischen Demokratie gegenüber ist nicht erstaunlich: dieser grundsätzliche Gegner der demokratischen Staatsform weiss als Nutzniesser der Seeherrschaft nur zu gut, dass die Demokratie ein notwendiges Übel ist, weil eben Demokratie und Seeherrschaft sich wechselseitig bedingen.

Auf die "biologisch-politische Auffassung," die den unbekannten Verfasser der AP auszeichnet, hat Nestle den Finger gelegt. Eine derartige Auffassung finde sich in jener Zeit sonst nirgends als bei Thukydides. Daraus zieht Nestle den gewagten Schluss, dass Pseudoxenophon mit Thukydides identisch sei.<sup>57</sup> Es tut der Grösse des Thukydides keinen Abbruch, wenn wir in Pseudoxenophon einen klaren Kopf kennen lernen, der in ähnlicher Weise gedacht hat wie sein jüngerer Zeitgenosse und Landsmann. Die griechische Literatur der Blütezeit gleicht einer Hochgebirgslandschaft, die in ein Nebelmeer gehüllt ist. Was wir Spätgeborenen erblicken, sind nur die Gipfel, die sonnenbeglänzt aus dem Nebel herausragen. Da vergisst man nur zu leicht das unsichtbare, mächtige Massiv, aus dem jene

Spitzen herauswachsen. Aus den zwischen dem Brief und dem Geschichtswerk nachweisbaren Ähnlichkeiten ein wie immer geartetes Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zu folgern, ist eine Naivität, die nur einem Anfänger verziehen werden kann.<sup>58</sup>

Die Datierung der AP in die Zeit des dreissigjährigen Friedens und die Auffassung des Schriftstücks als eines nicht zur Veröffentlichung bestimmten Briefes, den ein unbekannter athenischer Oligarch an einen Gesinnungsgenossen in Sparta geschrieben hat, befreit uns mit einem Schlag von einem Wust gequälter und quälender Hypothesen. Die biologisch-politische Betrachtungsweise ist kein Monopol des grössten Historikers der alten Welt; das lehrt uns dieser Brief, den Thukydides überhaupt nicht zu Gesicht bekommen hat. Zu einem "Rätsel" ist die *Athenaion politeia* erst durch die moderne Altertumswissenschaft gemacht worden. Sie ist kein Literaturwerk, wohl aber ein unschätzbare *document humain*, das realistische Gegenstück zu dem herrlichen Preisgesang auf die athenische Demokratie, den Thukydides dem Perikles in den Mund gelegt hat.

ROSTOCK

<sup>56</sup> Von einem "Doppelantlitz," das die Schrift trage, redet Nestle, 234. Gut urteilt über die "Zwiespältigkeit" Rupprecht, *Gnomon*, XVIII (1942), 6; sie sei nicht subjektiv, wie Gelzer meinte, sondern entstehe daraus, dass "sich die machtpolitischen Belange des demokratischen Athens mit den innerpolitischen Forderungen und Zielen überschneiden, die der Autor nach Ausweis seiner Schrift verfolgt."

<sup>57</sup> A.a.O., 241.

<sup>58</sup> "Ihm [dem Thukydides] muss die ps.-xenophontische Schrift, die ihm nach Ausweis der engen Berührungen im Text nicht unbekannt gewesen sein kann [gesperrt!], als durch und durch tendenziös und unwahr erschienen sein" usw., versichert Volkening, 45; Thukydides habe die Ausführungen des "attischen Oligarchen einer Widerlegung gewürdigt" (S. 46). Es genügt dem gegenüber auf Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, II, 397 und auf Ed. Schwartz, *Gnomon*, II (1926), 81 hinzuweisen.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### NOTES ON PROPERTIUS i. 2 AND i. 8

#### i. 2. 9-14

Aspice quos summittat humus formosa colores,

Ut veniant hederæ sponte sua melius,

Surgat et in solis formosius arbutus antris,

Et sciat indociles currere lympha vias;

Litora nativis persuadent picta lapillis,

Et volucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.

10 ut Itali, et MSS

This passage occurs in an elegy in which Propertius is seeking to persuade his mistress that she should avoid artificial aids to beauty. The elegy has opened with a warning that they will only spoil her natural charm because "nudus Amor formæ non amat artificem" (vs. 8). These six verses follow, each offering a different example to show that the beauties of nature appear at their best without artificial aid—an idea which reverses the more usual commonplace that nature requires the aid of art.

Although there is evident parallelism of structure in the lines of the passage, verse 9 alone lacks any word or words to indicate that nature acts spontaneously and without the intervention of art. The ivy grows *sponte sua* (10), the arbutus *in solis antris* (11), streams run *indociles vias* (12), shores attract *nativis lapillis* (13), and the singing of birds is sweeter *nulla arte* (14). It is particularly strange that precisely the first of the examples should have no equivalent of these expressions, with the result that verse 9 actually lacks any expression of the idea which it is the point of the examples to illustrate. A further cause for questioning the soundness of this verse is the unsuitability of *formosa* as an epithet of *humus* in this context. *Formosa*, if taken directly with *humus*, is a strange term to describe the soil and gives a false emphasis, since the point to be made is the beauty of the many-colored flowers, not the beauty of the soil from which they grow. *Formosa* might be defended as a transferred epithet properly applicable to *colores*, but it is then both awkward and otiose, since *quos*

(which often has the force of *quales*) is sufficient to give the qualitative idea. Such use of an unnecessary word is not characteristic of Propertius, whose habit is rather to pack every phrase with the fullest weight of meaning it can bear.

Both the difficulty offered by *formosa* and the incompleteness of verse 9 as it stands justify an assumption that, in the place of the odd and unnecessary *formosa*, there must originally have stood a word or words indicating that in this example, as in the others, nature is independent of art. The fact that editors have generally retained *formosa* is perhaps due rather to lack of a convincing alternative than to satisfaction with the manuscript reading. The best conjecture that has been proposed is *non iussa* (Sandstroem), which fully meets the requirements of sense but does not provide an explanation of the manuscript corruption. I suggest that *non culta* should be read for *formosa*. If this is what Propertius wrote, we are dealing with a common type of manuscript error. The resemblance between *CUL* (*culta*) and *COL* (*colores*) led to the loss of *culta*; subsequent to this loss, *formosa* (suggested by *formosius*, vs. 11) was inserted to replace the meaningless *non* and to make a metrically complete verse. (Although it is true that the simple fact of repetition, as in *formosa—formosius*, is not a sufficient reason for doubting a received text, nevertheless the substitution of a neighboring word for a true reading is a common manuscript corruption. When, as here, there are other grounds for suspicion, the existence of repetition may help to explain the origin of an interpolated word, even though it does not itself prove interpolation. Other cases are discussed below in connection with the text of i. 8.) The subject of this elegy is artificial adornment, which the poet urges his mistress to avoid; *cultus* is a key word and appears in three other places—as the noun *culta* in verses 5 and 16 and as the adjective *culta* in verse 26.

That *humus non culta* should appear in the line introducing the illustrative examples is accordingly appropriate, and the process of corruption which has led to the text of our manuscripts can be traced.

## i. 8. 9-20

- O utinam hibernae duplicentur tempora  
brumae,  
Et sit iners tardis navita Vergiliis,  
Nec tibi Tyrrhena solvatur funis harena,  
12 Neve inimica meas elevet aura preces  
15 Et me defixum vacua patiat<sup>ur</sup> in ora  
Crudelem infesta saepe vocare manu!  
Sed quocumque modo de me, periura, mereris,  
18 Sit Galatea tuae non aliena viae,  
13 Atque ego non videam tales subsidere ventos,  
14 Cum tibi propectas auferet unda rates,  
19 Ut te felici praevectas Ceraunia remo  
Accipiat placidis Oricos aequoribus.

In the text of this passage as it appears in the manuscripts (with the distich 13-14 following vs. 12) there are two points of difficulty: the relation of verses 15-16 to 9-14 is obscure, and verse 19 is almost certainly corrupt.

The situation in the passage is this: The poet's mistress is about to undertake a sea voyage from which he is attempting to dissuade her; he first hopes that wintry weather may prevent her sailing and then, with a sudden reversal of feeling, wishes that her voyage may be free from danger. If the manuscript order is retained, the wish in verses 13-14—that winds may not subside when Cynthia sails—precedes the change in feeling, and *tales ventos* must refer either to the winter winds implied in verses 9-10 or to the *inimica aura* of verse 12. In either case the wish in verse 13 is very strange, whether we assume that Propertius desires the continuance of a wind which he has characterized as *inimica*, or imagine a sudden and quickly passing desire that Cynthia may face the dangers of a stormy passage. To the latter explanation there is the practical objection, emphasized by Enk, that the ship was not likely to begin a voyage in the face of a raging gale. A further indication of disturbance in the manuscript order of lines is that verse 15 must be emended by changing *et* to *ut* or *patiat<sup>ur</sup>* to *patietur* in order to provide

a grammatical relation to verses 13-14. Enk attempts a solution by changing *et* to *ut*, *patiat<sup>ur</sup>* to *patiantur*, and *non* (13) to *tum*. His interpretation is that Propertius is expressing a wish that, at the moment when Cynthia sails, the winds may drop and becalm her ship long enough to permit her to hear him voice his anger. But the sense thus offered is feeble, and the three emendations required do not recommend the interpretation. The transpositions that have previously been proposed (15-16 to follow either 10 [Cartault] or 12 [Scaliger]), which leave verses 13-14 before verse 17, obviate the need to emend verse 15 but offer no improvement in sense.

In the arrangement of lines which I have proposed above, verses 13-14 are transposed to follow verse 18. It will be noted that verse 15 follows verse 12 without difficulty and no emendation is required: *aura* is the subject of both *elevet* and *patiat<sup>ur</sup>*, which are connected by *et*. In the first six lines as thus printed the poet wishes that winter storms may continue, so that he will not be left on the shore as Cynthia's ship departs. The next six lines reveal his change of feeling in the prayer for her safe passage, whatever she may have deserved. In this context it is clear that the winds are those which favor the voyage so that Cynthia will come safe to Oricos; *tales* looks ahead to *ut* in verse 19. There are thus three advantages gained by this transposition: (1) the manuscript text of verse 15 is shown to be sound; (2) the meaning of *tales ventos* becomes clear; and (3) we avoid the absurdity of making Propertius wish that bad weather will both prevent Cynthia from sailing and also accompany her when she sails.

The transposition has the further merit that it reveals the probable location and source of corruption in verse 19, where it is necessary either to reject *ut te* (the reading of the good manuscripts, N and A) in favor of *utere* (PDVV<sup>o</sup>), in order to provide a subject with which *praevecta* can agree, or to emend *praevecta*. Recent editors have chosen to adopt *utere*, though Butler and Barber, in doing so, state that *utere* is almost certainly a conjecture. If, however, verse 14 once immediately preceded verse 19, there is a simple explanation for the

corruption of verse 19: a scribe, copying before the original order of lines was disturbed, carried *provetas* into verse 19 from the preceding verse; *praepecta*, then, is merely a clumsy attempt at correction of *provetas*. (*Provetas*, which might well be an intermediate reading between *provetas* and *praepecta*, is actually the reading which we find in DVVo.) It is interesting to note that two other cases of a true reading which is lost through the substitution of a neighboring word are offered by various manuscripts in this elegy. In verse 15, where NA preserve *in ora*, DVVo have *arena*, which appears

in the same position in verse 11; and in verse 45, where N is again right in preserving *certos*, A has substituted *summos* through the influence of *summa* in the preceding hexameter. As a correction of *praepecta*, *post victa* (Heinsius) provides excellent sense and may well be right. A parallel with *victa remo* is offered by Ov. *Met.* xiv. 75-78: "Hunc (sc. 'scopulum') ubi Troianae remis avidamque Charybdim/Evicere rates . . . Libycas vento referuntur ad oras."

ARCHIBALD W. ALLEN

YALE UNIVERSITY

#### ADDENDUM TO "DONATUS AND THE SCHOLIA DANIELIS"

R. T. Bruère, in his review (*CP*, XLIII [1948], 126-30) of *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II*, is surely right in suggesting (p. 126) that one of the points which will be discussed in the "Prolegomena" is the question of the authorship of the non-Servian material in DS, the symbol used by the editors for the longer or Danielian commentary as a whole. Such a discussion would inevitably involve consideration of the theory that these scholia derive from the lost Virgil commentary of Aelius Donatus. Mr. Bruère mentions, as pertinent to this problem, "Donatus and the Scholia Danielis" (*HSCP*, LIII [1942], 157-69), an article in which I pointed out a number of stylistic differences between the non-Servian material of DS and Donatus' Terence commentary. In that study the text of Thilo-Hagen was used. I have recently had occasion to compare some aspects of the non-Servian scholia of DS on the first two books of the *Aeneid*, now presented with great clarity and exactness in Volume II of the "Editio Harvardiana," with an approximately equal amount of Donatus' Terence commentary, i.e., the first three acts of the *Andria*. This examination revealed indications of several differences in usage, not noticed in my article, which are perhaps suggestive enough to be of interest to those who are working with problems relating to the authorship or diction of these scholia. Final evaluation of these differences must wait upon the appearance of the subsequent volumes of the "Editio Harvardiana";

recourse to Thilo-Hagen will afford only a close approximation.

DS and S are the symbols used by the editors of the "Editio Harvardiana" for the contents of the longer and the shorter manuscripts, respectively. For lack of a traditional symbol, I have used "D" in the following paragraphs to indicate the non-Servian material of DS. In this note specifically, it represents the non-Servian scholia of DS on the first two books of the *Aeneid*. I have used only those scholia which are non-Servian in the strict sense of the term; that is, I have excluded not only those which are identical with S but those which are the same except for slight differences in word order or the like. "Donatus" is employed below to indicate the scholia of the Donatean Terence commentary on the first three acts of the *Andria*. I have used Wessner's text, and have excluded the additions and corrections of V<sup>2</sup>, which are printed by him in italics (see his Praefatio, p. xi). In both D and Donatus, only "philological" scholia, as opposed, for example, to mythological, historical, or philosophical elucidations, are adduced; these not only constitute a stylistic homogeneity but make up four-fifths of D and nearly all of Donatus. If further details regarding method are desired, reference may be made to "Donatus and the Scholia Danielis" (pp. 159-61).

In the handling of pedagogical questions, various differences between D and Donatus are indicated. First, D not infrequently appends such a question to what has gone before by the



use of *nam* or *enim*, e.g. (i. 143), "SOLEMQVE REDVCIT per 'solem' serenitas intellegenda, quia superius dixerat (88) 'eripiunt subito nubes caelumque diemque.' quis enim ignorat diem constare per solem?" (so i. 108, 338; ii. 55, 172, 314, 317, 480, 558). Donatus affords but one instance (36). Second, D is fond of the combination of *enim* with the interrogative pronouns *quis* and *quid*, as illustrated by the example given just above (so i. 143; ii. 55, 172, 317, 558). In Donatus, although these pronouns are used ten times (36, 45, 83, 100, 101, 119, 147, 364, 369, 375) to introduce such questions, there is only one instance (sc. 36) of combination with *enim*. Finally, Donatus four times uses the formula *quid si* at the beginning of questions of this type, e.g. (100), "VNICAM g. s. quid si taedio multarum filiarum? at 'unicam'" (so 101, 364, 369). In D, I have found no instance of this usage.

The adverb *modo* is sometimes employed by the scholiasts in the sense of "here" or "in this instance" with reference to the passage under discussion at the time. In cases where this *modo* appears in the phrase immediately following a lemma and refers to a single word, a difference between D and Donatus is evident. In the former the single word to be commented upon is introduced as the lemma, *modo* is placed next in order, and the elucidation then follows, e.g. (ii. 392), "ANDROGEI modo Latine declinavit; alibi Graece (VI 20) 'letum Androgeo'" (so i. 735; ii. 220, 277, 334, 556; in i. 85, *autem* intervenes between the lemma and *modo*, the pattern otherwise being the same; i. 310 is similar to i. 85 except that its relationship to a preceding lemma common to DS and S might be said to prevent a perfect contrast with the usage of Donatus set forth below). Donatus, on the other hand, introduces a lemma of two or more words, repeats from the lemma the single word to be commented upon, places *modo* next, and then presents his explanation, e.g. (2), "ID SIBI NEGOTI 'negotium'

*modo pro molestia et cura, non labore*" (so 190, 345, 346, 356, 550, 579; 354 seems to be an exception, the word commented upon not being repeated from the lemma).

*Nunc* in a sense identical with *modo* above is rare in both D and Donatus; but, since the available instances seem to indicate patterns of usage similar to those of *modo*, they are here presented. As in the case of *modo*, I am considering only those instances which appear in the phrase immediately following a lemma and which refer to a single word. In D there is the lemma of a single word, *nunc* next in order, then the elucidation, e.g. (i. 335), "EQVIDEM nunc 'ego quidem' significat, alias expletiva particula est" (so ii. 122, 238). In Donatus, we find the lemma of two or more words, the single word to be commented upon repeated from the lemma, *nunc* next in order, then the explanation, e.g. (265), "CVM IPSA 'ipsa' nunc domina mea" (so 487, 500).

*Deest* is the common property of Latin scholiasts. There is, however, a usage involving this word in which D and Donatus differ. In Donatus there are eight instances of the formula "*deest . . . ut sit . . .*" e.g. (61), "NE QVID NIMIS deest 'agas,' ut sit: ne quid nimis agas" (so 30, 188, 234, 340, 349, 395, 556). In D, according to my count, this formula does not appear.

The expressions employed by scholiasts to introduce paraphrases are extremely numerous. In the use of one of these at least, a distinction between D and Donatus may perhaps be indicated. *Quasi dicat* is common in the latter, e.g. (252), "NAM QVID EGO DICAM DE PATRE quasi dicat: quid ego de patre dicam, qui alienum accusaverim Chremem?" (so 24, 74, 86, 204, 281, 455, 476, 491, 519). In D, I have found two instances (i. 260; ii. 327).

ALBERT H. TRAVIS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES

### THE OEDIPUS OF PLAUTUS

In 1826 Friedrich Osann, in the commentary annexed to his edition of the fragmentary grammatical works which bear the name of Apuleius, made *obiter* an interesting and even

exciting promise: "fragmentum ex *Oedipode* fabula Plauti adhuc incognita producam."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L. Caecilii Minutiani Apuleii *De orthographia fragmenta et Apuleii minoris De nota aspirationis et De diphthongia* (Darmstadt, 1826), p. 108.

This promise Osann, who was almost immediately thereafter involved in an acrimonious controversy with Madvig concerning the date and veracity of "L. Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius," never kept, thus leaving to later scholars a tantalizing question. The extraordinary title of the play attributed to Plautus suggests a *tragicomedia* on a subject in which only the barbarous Macedonians (if we may believe Tertullian) could find merriment, and naturally gave rise to conjectures which need not be recapitulated here. Although no manuscript which could have been Osann's source was found, his reputation as a scholar generally sufficed to preclude suspicion of an imposture, so that, on his authority, Schanz and Hosius duly mention the *Oedipus* in their section (I, 74) on the "Verlorene Stücke" of Plautus.

The question can, I think, be disposed of definitely and summarily. Although Osann gave no hint concerning the extent of the *fragmentum* or the source in which he found it, it is probable that his discovery was made while he was preparing the edition in which he announced it. At this time he certainly consulted, and probably read thoroughly,<sup>2</sup> the *Commentaria de orthographia dictionum e Graecis tractatum* of Ioannes Arretinus (= Giovanni Tortelli, 1400-1466),<sup>3</sup> the first scholar to make use of the interesting and enigmatic grammatical fragments which Osann edited. It is, therefore, virtually certain that Osann found his remarkable fragment of Plautus in Tortelli, who, in the chapter "De sub praepositione" of his long preliminary discussion of Latin orthography, quotes, in support of his definition of *suppetiae*, "Plautus in *Edippo*: Sed memento siquid seruiunt senes suppetias mihi cum sorore ferre. Idem in eodem . . . ait auxilia mihi & suppetiae sunt domi."<sup>4</sup> We may also be

fairly certain that Osann failed to keep his promise, not because he was distracted by the polemic with Madvig but rather because he noticed, sometime after his book had gone to press, that Tortelli's quotations really come from the *Epidicus* 659-60: "Sed memento, si quid saevi(b)unt senes, / suppetias mihi cum sorore ferre," and 677, "auxilia mihi et suppetiae sunt domi." While we may, as scholars, censure Osann for failing to clear up a problem which he had created, we can, as men, understand why a scholar whose "credulity" had already exposed him to the mordant sarcasm of Madvig,<sup>5</sup> was reluctant to make a public confession of error.

Since Tortelli was obviously acting in good faith and it is improbable that he could have so mistaken the title had he used a manuscript of Plautus, it is probable that his source was some ancient lexicographic or grammatical work, similar to Nonius or Charisius, but now lost,<sup>6</sup> in which the reading *epidico* had, somewhere in the manuscript tradition, been corrupted or "corrected" to the more familiar *edipo*. We can, in any case, cease to worry about the riddles of a Plautine *Oedipus*.

REVILO P. OLIVER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

<sup>4</sup> In the edition of 1479 (which has no pagination) on the verso of the leaf which contains the signature-designation C3.

<sup>5</sup> Madvig's rejoinder of 1831 (= *Opuscula academica* [Hauniae, 1834], I, 26) begins: "Aegre tulit Fridericus Osannus, qui Apuleianum libellum tanquam egregium hermaeon ad Germanorum notitiam protraxerat, nebulam se pro Iunone amplexum videri." Osann was undoubtedly too enthusiastic in taking the *De orthographia* at its face value, but the mystery of "Apuleius" is still unsolved. Those interested in the problem should note that O. Skutsch's preliminary studies for his forthcoming edition of Ennius (*Classical Quarterly*, XLII [1948], 101) indicate that Achilles Statius, who was presumably the last person to see the lost manuscript once in the possession of Caellus Rhodiginus, acted in good faith.

<sup>6</sup> For some speculations about lost grammatical works available to Renaissance scholars, see *TAPA*, LXXVIII (1947), 404, 407 f., 410. On Tortelli's claim that he used fragments of Papirianus, see R. Sabbadini, *Studi italiani*, V (1897), 382 ff., where, however, the really fundamental question is overlooked or avoided.

<sup>2</sup> See esp. pp. xviii-xx, where Osann shows that Tortelli used at least "Apuleius minor" directly.

<sup>3</sup> This treatise, which had great influence in setting the norms of Latin orthography in the Renaissance was first printed in 1471. I use the edition "Vicentiae, accuratissime impressum Idibus Ianuariis millesimo quadringentesimo septuagesimo nono."

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Alexander the Great.* By W. W. TARN. Vol. I: *Narrative*; Vol. II: *Sources and Studies*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. xii+161+1 map; xiv+477+1 map. Vol. I, \$3.50; Vol. II, \$6.50.

Tarn's new work is conveniently issued in two parts, sold separately. The first one is written for the general reader. It offers the well-known chapters in *CAH*, Volume VI, rewritten, enlarged, and brought up to date. The Iliad of the Macedonian Achilles has found here an enthusiastic, as well as scholarly, narrator. Very well written, this brief but comprehensive biography will be particularly welcomed by everyone of us who has to teach about the Macedonian or to suggest a book for student reading. It would be well if in a new edition the author included the chapters in *CAH*, Volume VI, on the Persian and Greek background of Alexander's career, which are left out in this volume.

The second part gives four hundred and fifty pages of studies on sources and particular points of Alexander's biography. It is obvious that a reviewer cannot do full justice to an author who, with equal ease, treats of the queen of the Amazons and of the Macedonian cubit. I can merely present some observations taken at random. Tarn always excels in appreciation of military and geographical elements of history. Here, again, his chapter on Alexander's lines of communication (pp. 171-80) advances our understanding of the great captain. Particularly interesting is the discovery that Antigonos, as satrap of Phrygia, kept open the life-line of Alexander's campaign, where the road was besieged from the north by Cappadocians and from the south by Isaurians, both unconquered. The identification of Alexandrias in the lists in Stephanus and in Alexander's Romance (pp. 232-55) and the dating of the satrapy-list (Diod. xviii. 5) in the last year of Alexander's life (pp. 309-18)

are equally convincing. I think, too, that Tarn has strengthened his case against the authenticity of Alexander's posthumous plans (Diod. xviii. 4; cf. Curt. x. 1). He shows (pp. 378-99) that the name "Alps" mentioned in this document was not known to the Greeks at Alexander's time and that Alexander did not have septiremes, which figure in his alleged projects. Incidentally, the forger, speaking of Alexander's idea of conquering the West, may have been inspired by the no less ambitious plan which Alcibiades ascribes to the Athenians in Thucydides (vi. 30). I do not know whether it has been already noted that the famous *πόθος* of Alexander, his longing for far-off lands and sights, is again a Thucydidean motif (Thuc. vi. 24. 3). Further, it is a pleasure to see that Tarn discards the humbug, ancient and modern, about Alexander and Ammon (pp. 347-59). The Macedonian went to the oracle to ask to what gods to sacrifice in his Persian campaign. That is stated clearly in Arr. vii. 14. 7.

Speaking of the Greek cities of Asia (pp. 199-232), the author does me the honor of a detailed examination of my paper on the subject (*Rev. ét. gr.*, 1934). I advanced three propositions: (a) the Greek cities of Asia Minor were not joined to the League of Corinth; (b) Alexander concluded no treaties with these cities; and (c) they remained a part of his Persian dominion as conquered territory. Although demolishing my arguments, the author, in fact, accepts my two first theses. Since I have never been conceited enough to feel that I am always right, I am very pleased that such an authority as Tarn agrees with me to the extent of two-thirds of my hypothesis. For the rest, let us wait for some new inscription which will settle the question. It is a pity, however, that the paper in *Rev. de phil.*, 1939, where I treated Heuss's *Stadt und Herrscher* at some length, has escaped Tarn's attention. Had he read it, perhaps he would rely less on Heuss when speaking of Greek international law and cus-

tom. Tarn himself thinks that Alexander let the Greek cities of Asia Minor remain completely independent, so that legally they became no part of his empire. I am at a loss to know how to discuss this original solution, for there is no evidence for it. I imagine, however, that, had there been such a unique and momentous decision of Alexander, some trace of it must have survived in the tradition, owing to the extraordinary importance which the precedent would have taken for these Greek cities. I also wonder how Tarn fails to see that, if there were no treaties with these cities, they remained legally under Alexander's sovereignty as a part of the former Persian territory. In the meantime, the same paper of mine was attacked, as "a model of bourgeois formalism," by a Soviet author (A. Ranovich, *Vestnik Drevn. Istor*, No. 22 [1947], p. 37). But he ends up by restating my third thesis (that rejected by Tarn), namely, that the "Greek" cities were "autonomous unities" in Alexander's empire.<sup>1</sup>

A greater part of Tarn's volume concerns the criticism of the sources, directly or indirectly. By an interpretation of two main passages (Plin. *NH* iii. 57; Arr. vi. 11. 8), Tarn shows that the alleged evidence for an early date for Cleitarchus (before 300 B.C.) is inconclusive. On the other hand, he points out that Cleitarchus' statement that the Caspian is not smaller in size than the Black Sea is a quotation from Patroclus (Strabo xi. 508), who wrote about 280 B.C. That gives a *terminus a quo* for Cleitarchus (pp. 16-29). That suits me perfectly. For Cleitarchus mentions a Roman embassy to Alexander, an invention quite natural after Pyrrhus' war but hardly intelligible a generation before. Tarn, too, is probably right in exorcising the ghost of "Cleitarchean vulgate," allegedly exhibited by Diodorus, Curtius, and Justin. Nevertheless, he names Aristobulus and, "in all probability," Cleitarchus as two main sources of Diod. xvii (p. 128). For he simply divides the sources into two classes: authors favorable and those hostile to Alex-

ander. Since he finds both tendencies in Diodorus, he concludes that the compiler must have followed a pro-Alexandrian and an anti-Alexandrian author, to wit, Aristobulus and Cleitarchus, respectively. This method of dichotomy is hardly convincing. Napoleon was Stendhal's hero. Nevertheless, even when writing to defend his memory, Stendhal often enough finds fault with the emperor or repeats stories unfavorable to his hero. But Tarn even swallows the idea of some German pedant that the Peripatetics hated Alexander for the execution of Callisthenes, who was one of them, and that, to avenge the victim, they pictured the king as a tyrant and to a great extent carried with them public opinion (pp. 69 and 97). This idea of professorial solidarity, flattering as it is to our calling, is unsupported by evidence. In fact, as Tarn acknowledges, we know of no Peripatetic historian of the Macedonian.

Let us accept Tarn's standard of classification. The question now is how to recognize whether a story is favorable or unfavorable to Alexander. Callisthenes, to glorify his patron, told (or invented) the punishment of the descendants of Apollo's treacherous priests. Curtius regarded the same action as barbarous cruelty (pp. 274-76). According to the "good" sources, Alexander set fire to the palace at Persepolis to avenge Xerxes' depredations in Greece. Another version, which goes back to Cleitarchus at least, presents the action as a drunken affair. Tarn, who transforms an act of vengeance into "a political manifesto to Asia," whatever that may mean (p. 48), regards the Cleitarchean version as a hostile invention. In the opinion of the latest French historian of Alexander, it would be rather exculpatory for the Macedonian (G. Glotz and R. Cohen, *Hist. grecque*, IV, Part 1, 108). I note that Arrian (iii. 18. 12) feels ashamed for Alexander's deliberate act of sheer vandalism. Incidentally, the excavations, which Tarn does not mention, have shown that the palaces were thoroughly looted and that objects of art, even a Greek statue, were deliberately smashed or mutilated (A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* [1948], p. 522).

Tarn, however, attributes all the qualities of

<sup>1</sup> In the (unsigned) leading article of the same issue, Soviet historians are invited to expose the "anti-scientific" modernization of history by "Ed. Meyer, T. Frank, Rostovtzeff, Bickerman, etc."

a gentleman to his hero. Alexander could not have cut the Gordian knot, because it would make him flout the oracle (p. 264); he never cheated, as our "inferior sources" sometimes tell, for "it would be completely at variance with his type of character" (p. 54). Having quoted some boasting of Alexander, Tarn remarks: "That is not what most Englishmen would have said" (p. 291). By self-control, Alexander is chaste. Having rejected some scandalous stories about the Macedonian, Tarn stresses "the astonishing fact that, so far as trustworthy records go, Alexander . . . never had a mistress" (p. 323). But why should Ptolemy and Aristobulus, military historians, mention his concubines? Following Tarn's line of reasoning, some future author may conclude that American executives wrote letters in longhand because the secretary would hardly be mentioned by business historians, unless she married the boss. Being king of Asia, Alexander, of course, had a harem (Diod. xvii. 77). As to anecdotes about his self-restraint, I am not prepared to express an opinion about their veracity. But it is well to note the analogous story about Cyrus and Panthea in the *Cyropaedia*. Tarn dismisses the idea that Thais may have been present at Alexander's feast. For to suppose that he dined the mistresses of his generals "would be merely silly" (p. 48). Tarn does not allow Alexander to get drunk, except for medical reasons. He believes Aristobulus' statement that the king was no winebibber. But, while his authority says that Alexander remained at drinking bouts for the sake of his companions (Arr. vii. 29. 4), Tarn (p. 41) lets the king sit long "at dinner for the sake of conversation."

In the same anachronistic vein, Tarn tries to save the respectability of Alexander's political attitudes. Although no less authority than Nearchus records that Alexander desired to surpass the campaigns of Semiramis, for Tarn to ascribe such motives to his hero is to make Alexander "a very imitative character," that is, to make "complete nonsense of the character of one of the greatest men" (p. 50). How an author versed in classics can write such an appreciation of Alexander's desire to follow and

surpass the ancient conquerors is beyond me. Writing under Alexander's eye, Callisthenes glorified his patron as son of Zeus. Tarn (p. 358) makes a fine distinction: Callisthenes wrote not what the king wished but "what he thought Alexander would like, a very different matter." With all due respect to Tarn's knowledge of his hero, I doubt whether he can know better than Callisthenes what Alexander wanted from his historian. Whether the Macedonian himself believed in his divine nature is another, and probably insoluble, question. In any case, in 324, he suggested his own deification. Tarn, who mixes up with this request Alexander's Exiles decree, a completely different matter (see *Rev. ét. anc.*, 1940, p. 25), accepts the strange explanation, offered by some German authors, that Alexander wished to become a god for a purely political purpose, so that he could break the covenant of the League of Corinth at his pleasure (p. 371). I do not wish to ask whether this explanation agrees with the character of a man who allegedly never cheated. I even omit pointing out the tumbling foundation of the whole theory: except for Aelian (*VH* ii. 19), there is no evidence that Alexander had requested his apotheosis from the Greeks. We know only that Athens and Sparta voted divine honors for him and that Sparta, in all probability, was no member of the League of Corinth. I am only asking why the authors of this hypothesis never stopped to consider the simple fact that no Greek god had a juridical standing in the cities which would allow him to break treaties or to act outside the legal norms. In fact, there is no problem in Alexander's pretensions to divinity. Arrian (vii. 29. 3) has already explained that it was done for the sake of "dignity," to exalt Alexander above his subjects. For the same reason, under other conditions, Napoleon assumed the imperial title and, again under new conditions, Italians were daily told that the *Duce* was "always right." All modern investigations into the worship of Persian kings or alleged insights into Alexander's subconsciousness and "inner religious experience" (p. 372) are not relevant to the matter.

In the last chapter of his book, Tarn deals



with Alexander's pacifism. For had Alexander lived long enough, he would "have tried to do something to outlaw war." Tarn adds pessimistically: "and would have failed as the world has failed since" (p. 448). But if you read this long chapter on "Brotherhood and Unity" (pp. 399-449), it all boils down to the simple fact that after the mutiny of his Macedonian soldiers, jealous of the king's new oriental troops, at the huge feast of reconciliation Alexander prayed for harmonious understanding (*homonoia*) and peace between Macedonians and Persians (or, according to another report, between "all men") and, as Tarn translates it, for their partnership in the realm. Since Alexander's new army also included Bactrians, Arachosians, Jews, etc., and he now depended on this conglomeration for his campaigns (cf. Curt. viii. 8. 11), it is very probable that he spoke of harmony between "all men." But what has that to do with world reconciliation, brotherhood of men, pacifism, etc.? If Alexander simply desired not to be bothered by "communal" disturbances in his dominions, how could he have said it otherwise? But I regret that, in the interest of his thesis, a classicist has repeated the slur that Greeks "regarded barbarians both as enemies and as inferior people to themselves" (p. 399). What does "Greeks" mean here? Surely not Xenophon or Herodotus, and surely not Aeschylus, who speaks of Persia and Hellas at war as "sisters of the same blood" (*κασιγνήτα γένους ταιούτου*). When will historians stop speaking generally of Greeks, Romans, Jews, British, Russians, etc., as if peoples were, like homogenized milk, made uniform by the Creator?

Tarn himself explains the reason for his anachronistic portrait of Alexander. The brotherhood ideas which he attributes to his hero "were probably the most important thing about him, and they do more than anything else to negative the stupid but widespread belief that the man whose career was one of the great dividing lines of world-history was a mere conqueror" (p. 400). It is told that a captured pirate said to Alexander: "What is the difference between you and me, except that I have one ship and you a big fleet?" The fact is that (as the Peripatetics taught) in the realm of

nature, a part of which is history, the quantitative difference, if big enough, becomes a qualitative one. Alexander may have had all the virtues which Tarn ascribes to him. But, if the Macedonian had had no more than one warship or had spent his life in border wars, he would not be the subject of a Tarn's book. He is great because he conquered the Persian Empire and so changed the course of our civilization. Whether he had minions or dreamed of brotherhood of men neither adds to nor takes away from his deed. I wonder, by the way, how the title of "Great" was bestowed on him. By whom and on what occasion?

True to his ideological premise, Tarn insists on the impression made by Alexander's character. He was more than statesman or soldier, he was the man, and Asia felt him as one of the greatest of the earth (I, 142). An imposing array of Alexander legends—Moslem, Jewish, Christian—follows. Tarn touches here on the very important problem of historical remembrance. Let us state at the outset that no generation cares for deeds or sufferings in which it took no part. To every day its own evil is enough. Only through a constant effort is the recollection of the past preserved and passed from one generation to another. That means that some permanent body (state, church, party, etc.) must be concerned to carry on a historical memory. Since Alexander was the source of Hellenistic ruling houses and the Greek (or Grecized) ruling classes in the Orient, his memory was cultivated by these masters of the world (cf. M. Rostovtzeff, in *Mélanges R. Dussaud* [1939], p. 285). Tarn has shown elsewhere (*Bactria and India*, p. 300) that the Greek rulers in the East fabricated pedigrees, beginning with Alexander and Roxane, who was transformed into a daughter of Darius. Now Tarn asserts that all the countries claimed the hero as theirs, so in Egyptian story he became "a son of the last native Pharaoh" (I, 144). But the pharaonic descent was also claimed for Cambyases (Herod. iii. 1).<sup>2</sup> An Egyptian monument, which is mostly overlooked, seems to show how deliberately Alex-

<sup>2</sup> On the Cambyases legend in Egypt see now J. Schwartz, *Bull. Inst. français arch. orient.*, 1949, p. 65.

ander's pharaonic paternity was made known by official propaganda (A. Wiedemann, *Wochenschr. für class. Phil.*, 1917, p. 591). Naturally, Greek opposition attacked the posthumous reputation of the man who was *fons et origo* of the Macedonian dynasties. For centuries Alexander continued to be a controversial figure as the incarnation of monarchic principle: "Non utile mundo editus exemplum, terras tot posse sub uno esse viro."

The school, naturally, was the most important instrument of patriotic education. History was taught in Hellenistic schools (P. Collart, *Chr. d'Égypte*, No. 22, p. 505); geography invited allusions to Alexander's conquests (cf. O. Guéraud and P. Jouguet, *Un Livre d'écolier*, p. 10). The advanced study of arts and letters (so-called "rhetoric") gave a thousand occasions to deal with the Macedonian. Such school exercises are preserved, e.g., in *P. Milan.*, I, 21 (Alexander's prayer to Sarapis), *JHS*, 1908, p. 130; in the dialogue between the king and the Indian sages. There were, too, "rhetorical" letters of Alexander. One collection of his fictitious letters became a source of Ps.-Callisthenes' Alexander Romance (R. Merkelbach, *Aeg.* [1947], p. 144). This romance, in turn, became the principal source of international Alexander legends. As G. Maspero had brilliantly shown long ago (*Études de mythologie*, VII, 443), the popular tradition, continued in Byzantine-Coptic-Arabic historiography, transformed all pharaohs into magicians and astrologers. Since the military deeds or civil works of these ancient worthies, let us say a millennium after the end of Egyptian grandeur, were of no concern to the simple man, he attached to their names the only kind of action which would be of interest to him—the use of the magic arts. Tarn tells us (I, 143): "We ourselves have seen a Mir of Hunza who was descended from Alexander and bore a British title." Without knowing it, this chieftain was victim of an illusion deliberately created by the Hellenistic schoolteacher who, two thousand years before, in behalf of Greek rulers, had fabricated Alexander's myth.

E. BICKERMAN

New York

*Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies.* By EMMA J. EDELSTEIN and LUDWIG EDELSTEIN. ("Publications of the Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University," 2d ser., "Texts and Documents," Vol. II.) 2 vols. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Pp. xvii + 470; x + 277. \$7.50.

These handsome volumes give to the reader exactly what their subtitle indicates. The sources are arranged under topics and not (like Cumont's *Textes et monuments* or Heping's *Attilis* or Hopfner's *Fontes historiae religionis Aegyptiacae*) by authors. This has the disadvantage of breaking up the hymns of Isyllus, many of the relevant parts of Aristides,<sup>1</sup> and the section of Pausanias on Epidaurus; but an index reduces the inconvenience. The texts are followed by translations; these should have faced the originals, but typographical considerations may have been decisive. In any event, this is a most useful *Urkundenbuch*, for which warm thanks are due to the authors and to Dr. Paul Clement and Dr. Evelyn Clift, who assisted them; we may join the Edelsteins in their deserved tribute to the J. H. Furst Company for fine workmanship.

The authors were justified in not seeking to be exhaustive, particularly on inscriptions. Their selection of these is excellent;<sup>2</sup> but we

<sup>1</sup> The problem of selection from Aristides is hard; but xl. 21 (II, 329 f., ed. Kell; I, 62, ed. Dindorf) should be noted as another reference to the story told in I. 42 (p. 436, Kell; I, 514, Dindorf), quoted p. 335, text, 604, and the quotation of the latter passage should be enlarged to show that a dream is being described. (L. Edelstein wrote the second volume, but, since he and his wife throughout worked together, I say "the Edelsteins.")

<sup>2</sup> For important addenda cf. M. P. Nilsson, *AJP*, LXVIII (1947), 216. In reference to the rich evidence from Lebena, J. Zingerle's brilliant treatment of the texts set up by Granus Rufus should be used (*Commentationes Vindobonenses*, III [1937], 75 ff.). *Ἱελεῖς Ζωρ[ε]λ[ος] συνοδο[σ]ω[ρ]* (SIG, 1147) is to be added to my discussion in *JRS*, XXXVII (1947), 102 ff. of divine companions; so is H. Hanse, *Gott haben* (RVV, XXVII), to which Professor Campbell Bonner drew my attention. The epithet *συνοδοσώρως* was apparently used also of Asclepius (M. Guarducci, *Inscr. Cret.*, I, 173).

For Athens, reference might be made to W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 46 f., on the disposal of silver votives; W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 47 ff. (to which Professor Ferguson drew my attention).

still need a quantitative and chronological conspectus of the total body of dedications to Asclepius. Volume is important; *nama* in Mithraism is a different thing in view of recent finds in Dura and Rome from what it was when we knew isolated occurrences. We need also a list of names derived from Asclepius<sup>3</sup> and a survey of relevant coins, since these indicate official recognition. A map showing where the cult is attested would be of little service for Greece proper, since probably no city lacked it, but it would be of service for the rest of the ancient world. Asclepius was strong in Thrace and Lower Moesia<sup>4</sup> but, I think, far less so in the Latin-speaking world except for Africa, where Aesculapius sometimes represents Eshmoun. The Celtic area had Belenus and Granus as healing deities and equated both with Apollo.

A few details may be noted. The citation (p. 35, test. 58) from *Vita Sophoclis* prints without comment the emendation "Ἀλκωνος" (supported also by O. Kern, *Rel. d. Gr.*, II, 314, n. 1); reference should be made to Körte's more drastic but probable 'Ἀλφίονος' (cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXXVII [1944], 86, n. 34). The account given by Pausanias v. 20. 2-3 of the table of Colotes is unduly shortened (p. 348, test. 641); the original has the special interest of showing Asclepius and his divine family in a general Olympian context. They are no doubt there to illustrate the idea of health and strength;<sup>5</sup> as the authors elsewhere insist, Greek medicine was regularly concerned with regime as well as with the healing of diseases; but the "table" is noteworthy, since normally the Asclepius group existed in art and literature as a thing by itself and did

not, like Heracles, enter into the society of the gods.<sup>6</sup> Part of the text of *Passio in Coronatorum* mentioned in II, 256, might well be printed, and reference should be made to the new text in *Acta sanctorum*, Nov. iii, pp. 748 ff., and to the masterly analysis by H. Delehaye, *Les Passions des martyrs*, pp. 328 ff. (*Mart. S. Cypriani Antiochensis* is far less trustworthy and would probably be, at best, evidence for the Syrian Eshmoun and not for the Greek Asclepius<sup>7</sup> but might be worth a mention). Again, some indication should perhaps be given of the practice of naming ships after this god, as after so many others.<sup>8</sup>

There can be no doubt as to the usefulness of this collection of evidence, and the interpretative volume is wise and helpful (e.g., p. 31, on the originality of Pindar's treatment of the myth, which is like his rehandling of the tale of Pelops). The Edelsteins refuse to see in Asclepius either a faded god or a historic personage; on the first point they are almost certainly right and on the second very probably so. Asclepius is, for them, the archetypal doctor, with a story current before the time of Homeric epic—a doctor giving cures, not expiations, and serving as the patron of a traveling profession. The radiance of epic tradition was enhanced by Athenian acceptance in the fifth century and enabled Asclepius to attach to himself such apt abstractions as Hygieia and

<sup>3</sup> The presence of Asclepius and Hygieia on either side of Athena at Tegea (Paus. viii. 47. 1) and on one side of the entrance of the precinct of the Great Goddesses at Megalopolis (*ibid.*, 31; it contained a wide range of divinities) and the variety of deities in the colonnade at Titane (ii. 11. 8) does not invalidate this proposition. Nor does the association of other deities in cult (R. Herzog, *Abh. Berlin*, 1928, Part VI, p. 48).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Nock, *J. Theol. Stud.*, XXVIII (1927), 414 f.; for the acclamation cf. Aristid. xlviii. 21, quoted by Edelstein, I, 335.

<sup>8</sup> E. L. Hicks, *JHS*, VIII (1887), 414, 416 (with L. Robert's interpretation of ἐννοια, *Coll. Froehner*, I, 2). Asclepias is better known; F. Miltner, *RE*, Suppl. V, 948. 17. For Roman ships, cf. *ibid.*, 952 f. For ships named after the divine associates of Asclepius cf. Edelstein, II, 88, n. 45. Asclepius was thought to aid at sea; cf. Aristid. xlii. 10 and the hymn, perhaps written by Aristides, in Edelstein, I, 332, test. 596 (also F. Chapouthier, *BCH*, LIX [1935], 379, n. 1); but this should not be pressed; ships were named after a wide range of deities, and words relating to health would have a lucky sound (so a burial guild was called *collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae* [Dessau, 7213]).

We might well also have the dedication by L. Mummius at Epidaurus (*IG*, IV [ed. 2], Part I, 306; it was a monument which he appropriated); and what may be an equation on Thera of Apollo and Asclepius with the Cabiri (Br. Müller, *Diss. phil. Halenses*, XXI, Part III, 299).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. Dow, *HTR*, XXX (1937), 217, 219.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. Kazarow, *RE*, VIA, 495 ff.; and J. and L. Robert, *Rev. ét. gr.*, LVII (1944), 216; Y. Todoroff, *Pagan Cults in Moesia Inferior* (Sofia, 1928), p. 242.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. L. Robert, *Ét. anatol.*, pp. 70 ff., on the linkage of Asclepius and gymnasium (*ibid.*, pp. 384 ff., on inscriptions thanking both deities and doctors; on this cf. Zingerle, *op. cit.*, p. 107).

Iaso and to absorb certain cognate figures—heroes or “gods in a small way.”<sup>9</sup>

The Edelsteins insist that the divine cult is Epidaurian and arose not earlier than the end of the sixth century, as also that it is independent of the use of Asclepiadae as a conventional term for doctors. Again I agree, but with slight reservations. First, though Epidaurus was to be the mother-city for worship, many continued to regard Tricca as the mother-city of myth. The Asclepius of Tricca was not by way of establishing a pan-Hellenic reputation, but his cult had roots in the soil, as we see from coins struck at Larissa in the last third of the fifth century,<sup>10</sup> and some power of spreading. So Chiron, his mentor in myth, received cult not only in Thessaly but also—and very early—in Thera;<sup>11</sup> our records from Epidaurus do not mention him. Second, isolated dedications at Epidaurus seem to date from around 500 B.C.,<sup>12</sup> and the cult may be a little earlier than is here allowed and may have spread to other cities, like Aegina, which was closely linked to Epidaurus (Herod. v. 83), and Sicyon, where the statue by Calamis points to the recognition of Asclepius by the middle of the fifth century. (There were figures of Asclepius and Hygieia among the votives of Micythus at Olympia, together with representations of gods and heroes and Homer and Hesiod, etc. The dedicatory inscription was “to all gods and all goddesses.”<sup>13</sup> Given the context, Asclepius may well have been represented here as a legendary hero rather than as a figure of worship.)

Asclepius had more of a start than Orpheus, who almost always remained prophet rather than deity. Nevertheless, Asclepius could not have been a major cult figure in the circles in which Pindar moved—and he was familiar

with a wide range of religious interests, corresponding to his intimate knowledge not only of Thebes and Aegina but also of aristocratic Greece as a whole. Otherwise, would he have written as he did in the Third Pythian? At least, there would have been a danger of just such a reaction as his treatment of Neoptolemus in Paean 6 provoked. So far as the West is concerned, we note that, on the occasion of a plague, Rome vowed in 433 and dedicated in 431 a temple to Apollo; the establishment of Aesculapius with his own cult was much later—even if the form of his name points to earlier familiarity.<sup>14</sup>

Again, so far as I can see, no month in any known Greek civic calendar is named after a festival of Asclepius,<sup>15</sup> and only one community is known to have taken a name from him.<sup>16</sup>

Asclepius was rooted in Epidaurus as Priapus was in Lampsacus, and he had some appeal in a wider world. Nevertheless, it was the plague at Athens which turned the healer of Epidaurus into the god of general helpfulness. Asclepius acquired a remarkable position at Athens: a sacrifice preceding the Great Dionysia;<sup>17</sup> another before the annual pilgrimage to Eleusis; a place in the Diisoteria; a paean from Sophocles; a priesthood on a special basis. His acceptance elsewhere was no less remarkable and constituted the largest phenomenon in Greek religion since the rise of Dionysus. Asclepius retained a striking individuality, which the Edelsteins rightly emphasize. He had not a personal, as distinct from a professional, life; no relics, no translation, no formal apotheosis;<sup>18</sup> no fellowship with the Olympians.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Latte, *op. cit.*, p. 121, n. 2.

<sup>15</sup> Not even at Epidaurus.

<sup>16</sup> L. Robert, *Rev. ét. gr.*, XLVI (1933), 432.

<sup>17</sup> Did Asclepius owe this to the influence of his eager votary, Sophocles? On the introduction of Asclepius add, above all, Ferguson, *HTR*, XXXVII (1944), 86 ff. In *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII (1949), 157 ff., Ferguson shows that the introduction of Bendis also was a consequence of the plague. The Peloponnesian War was for Athens something like what the Second Punic War was for Rome.

<sup>18</sup> Mythologists speak of a “deification” and occasionally of a “catasterism,” but there was nothing like the entry of Heracles into Olympus.

<sup>19</sup> The special cult of Zeus Asclepius proves nothing to the contrary; either the title is a matter of dignity (cf. *CP*, XXXVIII [1943], 55), or it implies that the

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Nock, *HTR*, XXXVII (1944), 162 ff., on this category.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*, p. 247.

<sup>11</sup> G. M. A. Hanfmann, *AJA*, XLV (1941), 486; *IG*, XII, iii, 360.

<sup>12</sup> K. Latte, *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 117. R. Martin (*BCH*, LXX [1946], 354) now reports that no old construction is found under the temple of Asclepius, but (pp. 362 ff.) there was a trench with remains of sacrifices and (?) holocausts. This place of earlier cult probably became the *thesauros*.

<sup>13</sup> Paus. v. 26. 2. For the accompanying inscription cf. Zingerle, *op. cit.*, pp. 113 ff.

We tend to think of the fourth century as one of comparative poverty and secularism. Yet it witnessed the rapid rise of magnificent temples of Asclepius with rich offerings and images by famous sculptors; the range of places receiving religious delegates from Epidaurus was remarkable.<sup>20</sup> The Edelsteins rightly reject the view that this rise of Asclepius is an indication of the decay of old belief. As Weinreich has remarked, the action of Sophocles on his behalf shows that "an dem Gott mehr war als an dem Wundertrug der Iamata";<sup>21</sup> he cannot have felt anything in the cult to be inconsistent with the traditional piety which was so dear to him. For him Asclepius was something like a new saint with the value (doubtless not consciously formulated) of freshness and strength.<sup>22</sup> Nothing was taken from Apollo or Zeus; the gods could send Asclepius to aid (*Philoct.* 1437 f.). In general, we should speak not of decay but, with Nilsson, of "Durchbruch des Individualismus";<sup>23</sup> and men were moving toward greater urbanization and specialization. The lines inscribed over the entrance to the temple illustrate this: "Pure must he be who enters the incense-laden temple; and purity means thinking holy

thoughts."<sup>24</sup> Apollo had his famous inscribed maxims; this was one for Asclepius and fitted the rise of general moral values (cf. Eurip. *Bacch.* 74 and 370 ff., with the notes of E. R. Dodds, pp. 113 f.). The rise of Asclepius reflects also a tendency for a religion of emergencies to become prominent, as contrasted with a religion of normality; a parallel is the importance at the time of private soothsayers.<sup>25</sup> Willingness to believe was satisfied by men who produced their tales of wonder and revelation.<sup>26</sup>

Devotion to Asclepius continued to be intense; we may note Mytilene's invitation to other cities to take part in its festival for the god (L. Robert, *Bull. corr. hell.*, XLIX [1925], 233 ff.). A remarkable height was reached in the second century A.D., when the temple at Pergamum enjoyed great fame and a new temple was built there to Zeus Asclepius, as also one to Asclepius at Smyrna, at a time when new temples to Greek deities were exceptional. We still need a survey of the archeological material; in default of anything like an exhaustive *Monuments*, a modest find-list would be most helpful. For the other evidence these volumes will remain most useful.

Certain criticisms may be made. First, the authors write at times as though Asclepius was a specific figure capable of being seen from various angles, so that a composite picture can be made by combining the impressions and statements of different ancients. The cult and the myth are data; for us the god is not. The Edelsteins speak of the Orphics as expressing this or that opinion (they mean, thereby, ideas which appear in that late product of the study, the *Orphic Hymns*). Again, apropos of the rival birth stories, they say "people for quite some time must have been at a loss what to believe"

work of Asclepius is one activity of Zeus (cf. Sen. *Ben.* iv. 8 and *H. Orph.* 11. 12: ἀληθὴς Ζεὺς δ' ἐκφορῶν [of Pan]). A dedication at Athens ascribed to the second century A.D., *IG*, II [ed. 2], 4441. 10 f., has 'Ἀσκληπιῶ 'Αμφιαράω. G. Mellades, *Arch. Delt.*, VIII [1923], 58, is probably right in denying that this is asyndeton; Asclepius has, so to speak, subsumed Amphiaraus.) Asclepius appears among the Olympians in Lucian *Dial. deorum* 13, but that is deliberate humor. His absence from the long procession described by Callixenus. *ap. Athen.* v. pp. 197C ff., is significant. Aristides (xxxviii. 20) remarks that the sons of Asclepius were busy about the earth; that was thought of their father also.

<sup>20</sup> *IG*, IV, 1, 94 f., with P. Foucart, *Rev. ét. gr.*, XXXII (1919), 193 f. I owe this point to Professor Ferguson.

<sup>21</sup> *D. Lit.-Zeit.*, 1942, col. 779.

<sup>22</sup> Nock, *JHS*, XLVIII (1928), 36. Compare the later emergence of Zeus (Theos) Hypsistos as a deity of healing (*HTR*, XXIX [1936], 55, 63). I would now express no opinion as to the identity of this Zeus; the epithet may have been chosen as suggesting power (cf. the small shrine dedicated to *Iovi valenti* and established in the sanctuary of Aesculapius and Salus at Lambaesis (*CIL*, VIII, 2579b, d)).

<sup>23</sup> *Mélanges Cumont*, pp. 365 ff.

<sup>24</sup> A similar text was found in a sanctuary on Rhodes (S. Accame, *Mem. Ist. storico-archeol. di Rodi*, III [1938], 71 ff.; cf. Wilamowitz, *Herm.*, LIV [1919], 63 f.). Cf. a Lindian inscription discussed by J. and L. Robert, *Rev. ét. gr.*, LV (1942), 347; ἀγνῶς δὲ καὶ δόλος in the Hippocratic oath.

<sup>25</sup> Isocrates xix. 5 tells of a soothsayer who bequeathed to a friend his books on the art; he wandered about and made a good thing out of his new profession.

<sup>26</sup> For the attitudes involved cf. Nock, *Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc.*, LXXXV (1942), 478 f.



(II, 240), as though this was a question of Arius and Athanasius, as though myth was not always subject to variation. The resurgent nationalism of Messenia had a golden gift in the puzzling "Ithome" of Homer and thereon built its own story—which Delphi denied; for, after all, Delphi could not forget its old Dorian friends. (This was not like Didyma's claim to be the place where Apollo and Artemis were conceived, for that claim had no rivals.)

Second, the Edelsteins emphasize the use of *daímon* to address Asclepius in "even the oldest hymns" (II, 83; the reference is to the paean of Erythrae and to Macedonius, not to the fragment of Sophocles or to Isyllus). I cannot agree that this word was used in conscious distinction from *theos*; apart from considerations urged elsewhere,<sup>27</sup> compare Eurip. *Bacch.* 200, 272, 298, 377 f., and even Aesch. *PV* 494 (which is not contemptuous). It is certainly unwarranted to use Maximus Tyrius ix. 7 as evidence of older belief; Maximus was expounding philosophical ideas and, in fact, included Dionysus in the same category.

Third, it is urged that Asclepius "for those initiated into philosophy was the one who opened the path into the Beyond" (II, 131)—on the strength of *H. Orph.* 67. 8 and of the dying remark of Socrates. As for the first, the phrase "giving a good end of life" should mean "enabling us to die without previous ill health"; if there is any deeper meaning, it is a "good end" in the general sense of Herodotus i. 30–31. Four lines earlier in the hymn Asclepius is spoken of as averting diseases and the *keres* of death. Further, equivalent petitions are addressed to Pan (II. 22), Kronos (13. 10), Zeus Astrapaiois (20. 6), Proteus (25. 11), Hermes (28. 11), and Daimon, i.e., Zeus Meilichios (73. 9. Cf. a prayer to Aphrodite in Collitz-Bechtel, *Samml. griech. Dialektinschr.*, 5083). This is a formula like the appeals for deliverance or the sending-away of evils or of the directing of them toward other people: nothing peculiar to Asclepius.

Socrates was no broken Hippolytus or suffering Philoctetes, but many have thought

that his meaning was something like "after life's fitful fever he sleeps well." Were this so, it would be pure metaphor; Asclepius could not be supposed to have cured Socrates of the malady of living. Personally, I incline to the view that the words (whether of Plato or, it may be, of Socrates) are a deliberate enigma, lessening tension and giving the quiet close which suited ancient taste. If there is any specific meaning, it is that Socrates did his civic duty in the matter of religion<sup>28</sup> or possibly that he was grateful to the gods for reaching death without infirmity.<sup>29</sup> (So also we must be very careful not to read too much into *soter*; Asclepius saved from sickness and danger, not from sin or damnation.<sup>30</sup>)

Fourth, I cannot see any evidence for the idea that Alexander's patronage encouraged the cult. He made offerings to Asclepius,<sup>31</sup> as to the other recognized deities, but Asclepius was not one of his special devotions.

Other points are open to criticism,<sup>32</sup> but

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Willamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen*, II, 236; also *Platon*, II, 57 ff. (some everyday vow made for his wife or children). Willamowitz ascribes the remark to Socrates himself.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Artemidorus v. 9, where a cock is vowed to Asclepius if the man concerned should live in health for a year (health, curiously, not excluding ophthalmia).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. good remarks in Edelstein, II, 124 f. In the Menander fragment given as test. 419 on p. 212, *ouabets* is "cured," just as in Arrian II. 4. 10, not "saved."

<sup>31</sup> He sacrificed to Asclepius after recovering from the sickness which followed his bath in the Cydnus; his votive offering at Epidaurus was at the request of the Epidaurians (on it cf. *IG*, IV, Part I, 617. 5). As for the breastplate and spear dedicated at Gortys in Arcadia, Pausanias (viii. 28. 1) relates that the natives said that Alexander was the giver; that may be legend. (For arrows and spearheads, presumably votive, in the small sanctuary there cf. R. Martin and H. Metzger, *BCH*, LXIV/V [1940–41], 282; *ibid.* LXVI/VII, 334 ff. they report on the larger sanctuary farther out along the river.)

<sup>32</sup> Thus I, 198, test. 395 (cf. II, 179) refers to Caracalla, not to Alexander Severus. In II, 73, n. 21, Asclepius' change of name is cited among features fitting legend of the *theios aner* type; but the "change" is part of a scholastic etymology and no more. II, 120: "Athena . . . had given him a share in the blood of the Gorgon, as she had done to Erechtheus (T 3). This instance, too, must have endeared Asclepius to the Athenians." To say nothing of the fact that, strictly speaking, the name was Erichthonius, this tale about Asclepius is surely a late combination. In II, 252, n. 7, "the Egyptian shoes of the priest in Pergamum" are no sign of foreign influence; this was

<sup>27</sup> *JRS*, XXX (1940), 194, and XXXVII (1947), 109 f.; *HTR*, XXXVII (1944), 145, n. 21. Cf. Diehl, *Anth. lyr.*, II, 159, fr. adesp. 5. 6: *αἰσάνας ὁμόαια καὶ βολύβους*.

they do not detract from the value of this work as a whole. It gives an impressive picture of a cult the dimensions of which few of us realize. Asclepius had a meteoric rise and held his ground. Did not his cult supply a model for certain features of that of Sarapis, which came into prominence somewhat more than a century later? Sarapis had paeans by a famous author;<sup>33</sup> miraculous healings and their recording on a scale unprecedented in earlier Egypt; a family group; and a benevolent art-type which stands in sharp contrast with other fourth-century types of gods living easily.<sup>34</sup> Though Sarapis was identified with Zeus, he was remote from the old Olympians, and his activities were what really marked him. He, too, received rich offerings, and his sanctuaries multiplied. In fact, Asclepius (except where his name is used as an equivalent of Imouthes) seems to have left little trace in Hellenized Egypt.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, a text of the third century A.D., published too late to be available to the Edelsteins, describes Harpocrates (called "Carpocrates") as having given the doctors all the science of drugs to cure men and calls him "Titanian, Epidaurian"—the god of

Titanes and Epidauros—and makes Chalcis, not Egypt, his place of birth.<sup>36</sup> This is an individual document of a time when pagan revivalism (such as we see in Epidauros) was in the air. Nevertheless, it may serve to illustrate how in the give-and-take of the Greco-Roman world Asclepius gave more than he took.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since this review went to press I have chanced upon one passage which should be added to the literary evidence assembled in the book. It is Alexander Aphrodisiensis *De fato* 32: "It is for this reason that nearly all men fly to him [Asclepius] for help wherever he is most clearly manifested, convinced that he gives himself to those who strive to have him for a physician rather than to those who are indifferent" (trans. A. Fitzgerald). This illustrates the persistence of the strength of the cult in the second century of our era, on which I have remarked earlier.

Let me add also a reference to Ulrich Hausmann, *Kunst und Heilum: Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Asklepiosreliefs* (Potsdam, Am neuen Markt: Verlag Eduard Stichnote, 1948). It is an admirable study of archeological evidence.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Harvard University

a way of avoiding the common taboo on leather in shrines (F. J. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum*, V [1936], 109 ff.; J. Quasten, *AJP*, LXIII [1942], 207 ff.; Nock, *CP*, XXXVII [1942], 89, n. 3; leather from a sacrificial victim could be allowed, Dölger, *op. cit.*, p. 111, n. 9; and cf. *HTR*, XXXVII [1944], 165, on the virtue of the act of offering). II, 255, n. 2, misinterprets Aristid. xxvi. 105 (p. 122. 23, Kell; I, 368, Dindorf); it means: "Asclepius and the Egyptian deities are performing more miracles than ever," not "of all Greek deities his fame alone had risen in equal measure with that of the Egyptian gods." For other points cf. the reviews by Nilsson (cited, n. 2, above), H. J. Rose (*CR*, LXI [1947], 51 f.), D. M. Schullian (*CW*, XLI [1947], 28 ff.).

<sup>33</sup> Cybele also had her tradition of hymns; cf. Serv. on *Georg.* II. 394: "hymni vero Matris deum ubique propriam, id est Graecam, linguam requirunt."

<sup>34</sup> Cf. G. Rodenwaldt, *Abh. Berlin*, 1943, Part XIII, *passim*, with the fine phrase (p. 16), "Das unbefangene göttliche Fürsichsein," and (p. 24) the comparison with the Epicurean idea.

<sup>35</sup> The Asclepius type on Alexandrian coins under the Empire may well represent largely official glorification of Greek deities (cf. J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen*, I, 100). So again Latte, *Gnomon*, VII (1931), 123, has remarked on the absence of Sarapis from Epidauros before the Christian era. At Lebena we find: Διὶ Σεράπιδι Ἀσκληπιῶ ἱερῶν Τετραλῶν Ἀσθηνῶν (*Inscr. Cret.*, I, xvii, 27, p. 173), but in a text of the third or fourth century A.D.

*Teatri greci arcaici da Minosse a Pericle*. By CARLO ANTI. ("Monografie di archeologia," collezione diretta da CARLO ANTI, Vol. I.) Padua: "Le Tre Venezie," 1947. Pp. 337+8 pls.; 81 ill. in text. L. 3,000.

This book comprises ten numbered chapters. i, "Edifici teatrali primitivi"; ii, "Il teatro di Dioniso Eleutereo ad Atene"; iii, "Il Teatro di Siracusa"; iv, "Resti e indizi di altri teatri quadrangolari"; v, "Teatri minori dei demi attici"; vi, "Telesteri, ecclesiasteri e odei"; vii, "Gli edifici teatrali dell'agorà di Atene"; viii, "Aristofane e il Lenèo"; ix, "Genesis della scena a parasceni"; x, "Scenografia e scenotecnica nei teatri arcaici." There are also a "Premessa," "Conclusioni," a bibliography for each chapter, and a well-arranged index.

<sup>36</sup> R. Harder, *Abh. Berlin*, 1943, Part XIV, p. 8 (note also I. 8: Βάχχους καὶ Βάχχας δὲ συνθεσώμεν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἄλλοις ἱεροῖς ὡς ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ ἱερῷ). This is another instance of the *comes* idea mentioned in n. 2).

Five of the plates are excellently drawn restorations by Italo Gismondi. As is evident from the titles of the chapters, the scope of the book is broad, and no complete summary of its content is presented here.

The interest of the work is largely in the exposition of a thesis, which may be stated as follows: the circular orchestra and the curvilinear *koilon* corresponding to it did not exist in any Greek theater before the late fifth, or perhaps the fourth, century; earlier theaters, by direct descent from the Minoan "theatral areas," had rectilinear orchestras and *koila*. The idea is not totally new; Bulle (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 70, 79) suggested that there were rectilinear wooden seats in the Athenian theater in the fifth century, but did not doubt that the orchestra was round. It is certainly not unreasonable to suppose that, if the one element was rectilinear, so was the other. The positive evidence for Anti's view is difficult to judge. The indications that favor continuity in the architectural tradition are not conclusive; and there is a specific difficulty in the fact that the form believed by Anti to have been usual in the early Greek theaters is not rectangular, as in the supposed Minoan ancestors, but trapezoidal. The theater at Syracuse, which Anti studied thoroughly, affords good evidence for the trapezoid, in a water channel which apparently defines the boundary of the seats; and in Athens there is evidence for some kind of rectilinear *proedria* in the fifth century, as had previously been noted. As for the additional evidence that is found in these theaters and in numerous others, I must confess myself unable to appraise it. Anti's conclusions are not based on his own examination of the ground, except at Syracuse and Catania, and he is not himself always equally assured in his interpretations, but he thinks that the total of the evidence places his hypothesis beyond question. At all events, his case is excellent on the negative side: there seems to be no evidence whatever for a circular orchestra, or for seats of corresponding type, before the late fifth century. Merely in establishing this fact clearly, the author performs a distinct service.

Chapter vii deals largely with problems of Athenian topography. To a considerable ex-

tent he follows Dörpfeld, even in regard to the Enneakrounos; but he accepts Thompson's Royal Stoa and thinks that the Lenaion and the Dionysion were separate precincts, though close together. The orchestra in the Agora is found in a trapezoidal terrace south of the Tholos. This may not convince, but he has the point that those looking for a round orchestra have found no trace of any.

In the ninth chapter the author considers the origin of the "scena a parasceni," which appears in stone in the late fifth century. (As to whether it had previously existed in wood, he seems to vacillate.) In the first place it is remarked, in agreement with Holwerda, that the word *παρασκήνιον*, "per analogia con tutte le formazioni similari," must mean "lateral skene" and not "what is beside the skene." That is wrong; it is difficult to say that the word could not mean "lateral skene," but the analogies strongly indicate the other meaning (cf. my remark on such forms, *CP*, XXX [1935], 259 ff.). Anti does not discuss the very real problem of whether the ancients used the word for the part of the theater to which we apply it.

He feels sure that the "scena a parasceni" was not a form created especially for the theater, but must have been intended to recall to the spectators an architectural type well known to them and immediately recognizable. This view, although previously advocated, is far from certain. Anti then concludes that the type imitated must be the palace (*anaktoron*) of the tyrants of the sixth century, of which a specimen is known at Aeolian Larissa; this type, as Schefold had suggested, is derived from the so-called *hilarai*; the *βασιλικοὶ στοᾶι* were so named because they corresponded in form to the façades of these palaces.

Now there is certainly a resemblance between the façade of the building at Larissa and the scene buildings of a theater; beyond that the hypothesis is uncertain, to say the least. There is no reason to suppose that the tyrants had dwellings of any specific type. A singular building at Selinous makes a very poor palace and offers no evidence. It is impossible to take seriously the suggestion that the Propylaea at Athens were deliberately given "l'aspetto dell'

anàctoron." As for the βασιλικοὶ στοαί, the only fact available is that the structure so named at Athens, if correctly identified, had a plan somewhat like that of the scene buildings. There is no evidence that other stoas of similar plan were also called "royal," that other stoas of similar name had the same plan, that the name referred to the plan, or that the plan occurred in any palace in Greece proper at any time.

A connection between the structure at Larissa and the Persian buildings at Persepolis seems very likely. Perhaps the Larissa type and the great Ionic temples, with their forests of columns, were the chief sources for the architectural style of Persepolis; or perhaps there was a common source elsewhere. But the *hilani* has a very doubtful claim to any place in this connection. The occurrence of pillars on the outside of a building, not in a peristyle or a prostyle arrangement, is not valid evidence for any influence of the type represented at Sinjirli and Tell Halaf, even as regards the façade; and that type has a characteristic interior scheme also, which is not approximated at Larissa or at Persepolis. In view of the general looseness of thought about the *hilani*, it is not remarkable that it has been thought to be derived from the Mycenaean megaron; and it is not in the Greek theater that the influence of the type has been suspected with least reason (cf. *JNES*, 1942, pp. 61 ff.).

In the Conclusion there is a suggestion that was hardly in the author's mind when he wrote earlier parts of the book: that Polykleitos, architect of the theater and tholos at Epidauros, was the inventor of the "round" theater. It is argued that in the tholos Polykleitos showed a predilection for curved forms, and that earlier round buildings belong chiefly to the Peloponnesos. Whatever may be thought of these reasons, the hypothesis demands that the theater at Epidauros be earlier than the Lycurgan period at Athens. (Anti admits a possibility, but no more, that the Athenian theater was "round" in the late fifth century.) This chronological requirement presents no difficulty to the author, who states as a fact that the *cavea* of the theater at Epidauros was constructed between 370 and 360

B.C. How did he learn that? Certainly not from Bulle, who is the only authority cited for this theater; he (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 241 ff.) dates it to the end of the fourth century, and this is surely the usual opinion. A somewhat earlier period has been suggested, but, as far as I know, neither evidence nor authority can be quoted for 370-360. On the origin of the round type, the author might well have cited Lehmann's remark (in Bulle, *op. cit.*, p. 63) that wooden seats would naturally be rectilinear, whereas stone seats could be curved as well as not.

Pickard-Cambridge's *The Theatre of Dionysus* (1946) was naturally not available to the author; neither, evidently, was William A. McDonald's *Political Meeting Places of the Greeks* (1943), in which a number of Anti's early structures are discussed, or R. Martin's article (*BCH*, LXVI-LXVII [1942-43], 274-98), in which a part of Anti's argument is paralleled in remarkable fashion. It is more surprising that he apparently made no use of Pendlebury's *Archaeology of Crete*, which would have been useful for the first chapter, or of Kourouniotis' book on Eleusis.

The author writes clearly and often shows sober judgment, but sometimes he is inclined to overestimate his evidence, especially in referring back to conclusions reached earlier. There are various passages that seem to have been written in haste and never revised. For example, the Propylaea at Athens are dated 430 (p. 270) and 442 (p. 278); neither date is within the period of construction of the Propylaea, which undoubtedly is well known to the author. He places the "theatral area" at Gournia in the fourteenth century or later (p. 34) or at the end of the second millennium B.C. (p. 38), though it is usually thought to be earlier than the general catastrophe of about 1400. Kapara seems to belong to the ninth century rather than to the twelfth (p. 265), though this is a wartime discovery which might well escape the author. Barrekub was a man, not a building (p. 265); this is a somewhat remarkable error, but is implicitly corrected in the Index, and is probably due to hasty writing like the rest. None of these errors has any real importance; but it is

inevitable that the reader should suspect insufficient consideration in other passages, where its effect may be less obvious but more serious.

In conclusion it should be emphasized that, as far as the chief thesis of the book is concerned, this review is superficial. Other commentators probably will be more definite in their appraisal; but what is called for is a complete re-examination of the traces, always scant, of the earliest period in Greek theaters. It may be that this book, despite some imperfections, will mark an epoch in its field.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

---

*Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer.* By ALBIN LESKY. Vienna: Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, 1947. Pp. 341.

Like many another northerner, Herr Lesky seems to have lost his heart to the ever changing, ever tempting Mediterranean. Ordinarius in classical philology at Innsbruck, he has for some time been investigating the relations of the Greeks to the sea and now presents his general conclusions on the subject, which he conceives in aesthetic terms. Lesky, that is, proposes to explore the spiritual adaptation of a northern people to the sea and the very significant place of the sea in its view of nature. He is concerned with the maritime history of the Greeks only as a background and not at all with naval architecture, harbor works, and the like. This point of view dictates a primary reliance upon the mythology and poetry of the Greeks. The author generally passes over the prose writers; he draws upon some evidence from painting but ignores the fields of architecture, sculpture, and numismatics.

Within these limits the analysis which Lesky presents is not startling or in its details entirely original, but it is interesting and always carefully thought out. He begins with a lengthy refutation of the view that the Greeks were born seamen. As he emphasizes, the land-loving attitude of Hesiod was a major theme throughout Greek thought. Once launched on the sea by the Cretans, the Greeks learned rapidly but never became ad-

venturous vikings. The great question at this point is: How much did the Greeks borrow from the pre-Hellenic inhabitants of the Aegean? Since we know little of the beliefs either of the Cretans or of the Greeks before they entered the peninsula, a clear answer cannot be given. Still, something might be won, and Lesky gallantly makes the attempt.

When the Greeks first come into our ken, it is as a remarkably full-grown people. So, though one might expect to find that the sea has no great influence on them at the outset, actually the sea does play a significant part in the earliest Greek mythology. The concept of Okeanos as encircling the earth, the source of all earthly waters and even the source of all things, is a basis of early Greek cosmogony; its development Lesky traces down through Plato. The concept has Babylonian and Egyptian parallels, but Lesky refuses to pin down the source as far as the Greeks were concerned. He suggests only lightly that it may have come through the Cretans.

The longest chapter of the book contains an analysis of the divine powers of the sea. Poseidon, the Dioscuri, and the Nereids are of Indo-European origin; unlike the malignant Germanic water spirits, the Greek divinities are mostly friendly and even foretell the future, though there are a few lingering remnants of their originally hostile character. The most clearly pre-Hellenic elements of the mythology are the fabulous beasts of the sea and the idea (*ex* Wilamowitz) that a leap into the sea made one divine. In their variety and frequent ability to change shape, these figures of the waves reflect Greek appreciation of the variety of the sea.

With Homer the story becomes more consecutive. The explanation thenceforth of the Greek attitude toward the sea down to Hellenistic times is an absorbing illustration of conservation of ideas, coupled with change and ever increasing complexity of a cultural pattern.

Despite differences in tone between the Homeric epics, in both the sea is a wild thing, perceived primarily acoustically as roaring on a rocky coast. Man stands in amazement, doubt, even fear, before it and yet feels in its



powers something akin to his joy in battle. In a few instances (e.g., *Iliad* i. 350) Lesky thinks the sea is treated as echoing a man's emotions. With the onset of colonization, lyric poetry down to 500 reflects an ever wider appreciation of the sea, which can best be proved from Pindar. Aristocratic, Boeotian, he was not interested in things nautical, and yet words and illustrations from the sea appear frequently in his odes. The sea is becoming an almost unconscious element of the Greek genius.

The Persian wars are a great dividing point, for the sequel is the sea-based Athenian empire. The necessary reflection in Athenian thought is illustrated almost entirely from the tragedies, of all ancient literature the most deeply impregnated with the sea. Lesky analyzes their themes as a group, here treading a well-worn path, and then distinguishes the subtle differences in the three great tragedians.

Euripides, describing the sea purely for itself, as in the morning song from *Phaëthon*, leads into the Hellenistic world. In considering this era, the author breaks new ground in one of the most interesting and acutely argued sections of the book. The old ideas continue, as in the theme of the dangers of the sea. Yet seafaring now is an old, customary practice; the view of the sea is less fresh and direct than formerly. Moreover, the subject of a great Hellenistic state had a much less direct contact with the sea than did a member of the city-state of Athens; from the great metropolises, literary men looked at nature as something distinct from themselves and yet as something desirable. So the sense of the sea often becomes more intimate: we find it called "beautiful," its peace and the joys of the seashore are celebrated, love and marriage are compared to the sea. Men with troubles sit by the sea, looking into the distance or hearing the roar of the surf. The poor fisherman becomes a regular item in stock of the pathetic. And so one glides into the empire, where nothing new appears, but the old, old themes recur again and again. Musaeus, singing of Hero and Leander in the fifth century, echoes Homer's feeling of the wildness of the sea; Libanius agrees with Hesiod that the land is best of all.

The value of such a study lies in its detailed analysis of the retention and mutation of

ideas, but Lesky offers in brief conclusion his judgment that the Greek view of the sea is not one of great expanses. It reflects, rather, life in island-studded, narrow seas. The Greeks felt the wildness of the sea and appreciated it when gentle; but the love for great distances or delight in the wildness of the waves, which he illustrates from Ibsen, does not appear in Greek thought.

It is regrettable that neither Lesky nor Saint-Denis (*Le Rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* [1935]) compare in detail the Greek attitude toward the sea with that of the Romans. In Roman poetry, on the whole, the Roman does not appear at home on the sea. As Saint-Denis puts it, he enjoyed looking at the sea from the shore. Again, the sea is often an artificial device in Roman poetry. But now Lesky seems to prove that the Hellenistic Greeks had much the same attitude; in aesthetic terms there is little differentiation between the two. The best example that Lesky finds of a whole literary work which is penetrated by "frischer Seeluft" is the *Rudens* of Plautus. No doubt it was copied from Diphilus, but a Roman playwright did think it would appeal to Romans as well. Again, where in Hellenistic literature will one find a feeling for the immensity of the sea akin to that shown by Lucretius?

These reflections suggest that we might do well to walk warily in making the customary distinction between Roman and Greek on the sea. In his recent *Studies on the History of Roman Sea Power in Republican Times* (1946) J. H. Thiel shows that the Romans of the Republic were landlubbers when it came to creating a fleet for war. I suspect that if we had adequate evidence for the fleets which fought at Cos and elsewhere we might have to draw the same conclusion for the Hellenistic powers. Nor can we forget that the greatest ancient experiments in the use of naval power in time of war were carried out by Romans in the ever instructive and amazing wars of Caesar and Octavian and that the Romans were the first people in history to create a standing fleet. I would not argue that at Rome the sailor class itself was ever as numerous or as skillful as the Greek or that the Romans were as impregnated with the salt of

the sea as were the Athenians of the fifth century; but, as Lesky notes, that "Seeverbundenheit" occurred only once in the ancient world. Leaving out the unique and arguing from the political and aesthetic points of view, one must say that Rome and the Hellenistic states seem to have had much the same attitude toward the sea; the Romans might even come off the better.

In its main lines Lesky's book is well constructed, and he shows mastery throughout of the tools and skills necessary for its construction. He has a sensitive taste. He has read very widely in Greek literature—the index of citations covers seven closely printed pages—and he engages in lengthy quotations (usually in his own translation). He knows the modern commentators as well and heaps them up in twenty-four pages of notes at the end. Though he explicitly claims not to be complete, he does dislike leaving out anything; and so interested is he in the turns of his subject that he glides off into little excursions, as when he slides from Homer's views on fish to the fish market at Athens. This detail is always interesting; but at times, as one reads page after page of his colloquial Austrian, one feels one's self offshore on a choppy day. Every now and then the boat lifts onto a crest from which we can see the land, but all too often the only vista is of little waves dashing in all directions.

Physically, the book shows the effect of the war in the quality of paper and binding, but it is well illustrated with reproductions of vases and paintings. Typographical errors are few and concern mainly references between plates and text. There is an index, but not a bibliography; the ample notes make the latter unnecessary.

CHESTER G. STARR, JR.  
University of Illinois

*Studi sui "Topica" di Cicerone.* By BENEDETTO RIPOSATI. ("Edizioni dell' Università cattolica del S. Cuore," Serie Pubblicazioni, Vol. XXII.) Milan: Società editrice "Vita e pensiero," 1947. Pp. xv+338.

The basic difficulty in understanding Cicero's *Topica* arises from the fact that, although

Cicero professes to be expounding Aristotle's "disciplina inveniendorum argumentorum," yet his formulation of this subject is entirely foreign to that of Aristotle. For Cicero includes in a single list the "topics" appropriate to all argument, whether philosophical or rhetorical; and, indeed, Cicero in this work carries to its furthest development his view of the inseparability of philosophy and rhetoric. Aristotle, however, found it necessary to draw a distinction between the methods of the rhetorician and the methods of the philosopher, corresponding to the difference in their subject matter and their ends. The problem of finding arguments is different for each; hence there is no place in Aristotle's scheme for one general list of the sources of arguments.

Not only does Cicero arrange his series of topics without regard for many Aristotelian distinctions; he even introduces topics not found in Aristotle. For, since Cicero was undertaking to make a comprehensive list, he included not only Aristotelian formulations of argument in terms of such concepts as genus and species but also the Stoic formulation of necessary hypothetical arguments and the probable arguments of the empiricists. Cicero's *Topica* has, then, a basically non-Aristotelian structure, into which are inserted many fragments of Aristotle's philosophy, along with doctrines of non-Aristotelian schools.

Riposati's *Studi* contributes much both to the understanding of Cicero's own thought and to the estimation of Cicero's debt to Aristotle. He analyzes the work in detail, section by section; and, after giving his interpretation of each passage, he undertakes to find its source. His treatment of such subjects as definition, *quaestio*, and *status causae* will be very welcome to students of ancient rhetoric. On pages 301-36 he gives an extended bibliography of ancient rhetoric, an index of passages quoted, and indexes of Greek and Latin terms. Another useful feature of the book is the diagrammatic analysis of Cicero's *Topica* (following p. xv), though at two points I should have made a slightly different scheme: *conlatio*, *comparatio*, and *exempla* (42-45) are, I believe, three co-ordinate divisions of the topic *ex similitudine*; *exempla* should not be treated as a subhead under *comparatio*. And to Riposa-

ti's list of the kinds of *quaestiones actionis* (86) should be added, "ad motum animi . . . plane tollendum." In the topic *ex comparatione* (68) the four terms which he lists under *minorum* should be listed under *maiorum* and *parium* as well.

Riposati's preoccupation with the Aristotelian element in the *Topica* has caused him to overlook certain other aspects of the work. A good example is his treatment of the topics *ex consequentibus et antecedentibus et repugnantibus* (pp. 116-29). Riposati recognizes that five of the seven forms of argument which Cicero lists here are also found in Stoicism; yet he prefers to follow Wallies in suggesting that Theophrastus may have elaborated "definitivamente" the five or seven modes of the hypothetical syllogism. But there is, in fact, no evidence whatever that Theophrastus formulated the five so-called *ἀναπόδεκτα*, which are specifically attributed by Galen to Chrysippus (cf. Bochenski, *La Logique de Théophraste* [Fribourg, 1947], pp. 116 f.). As for Cicero's sixth form, it is identical with his third, even to the terms used to describe it. Of the third form Cicero says, "cum autem aliqua coniuncta negaris" (54); and of the sixth, "deinde addunt coniunctionum negantiam" (57). Cicero's seventh form, finally, is not valid: "Non et hoc et illud; non autem hoc; illud igitur" (57). Suppose that *hoc* is the proposition, "I

am now in Paris," and that *illud* is "I am now in Rome." The argument of the seventh form would then be as follows:

The propositions "I am now in Paris" and "I am now in Rome" cannot both be true.

The proposition "I am now in Paris" is false.

Therefore, the proposition "I am now in Rome" is true.

But, as it happens, I am in neither Paris nor Rome. Riposati, in short, appears to be unaware of the difficulties involved in the sixth and seventh forms.

Riposati's treatment of the topic *ab adiunctis* (pp. 114-16) is also inadequate. Unable to find a source for this topic in Aristotle, he concludes that here "Cicerone abbia raccolta dottrina peripatetica di più tarda elaborazione." But he offers no evidence whatever that would link this topic to any member of the Peripatetic school. Nor does he even consider the possibility that the topic might have been taken from a non-Aristotelian source. Yet he could have found in the *Rhet. ad Herennium* ii. 3 ff. some striking parallels to the Ciceronian passage. The words *quid ante rem, quid cum re, quid post rem evenerit* (51) correspond to *praeteritum, instans, consequens* in *Herenn.* ii. 8. Further similarities may be seen from the following table (the order of points in *Herenn.* has been altered somewhat, and neither list is complete):

*Topica* 52

*Ante rem*

apparatus  
conloquia  
locus

*Cum re*

pedum crepitus  
streptus hominum

*Post rem*

pallor  
rubor  
titubatio  
signa conturbationis et conscientiae  
gladius cruentus

*Herenn.* ii. 8

*praeteritum*

num quid appararit  
num quem convenerit, num quid dixerit  
ubi fuerit

*insians*

crepitus  
streptus

*consequens*

expalluisse  
erubuisse  
titubasse  
signa conscientiae  
telum relictum

There is similarity also in the fact that both authors regard arguments of this type as fallible and as appropriate to conjectural cases. There is, of course, a number of differences in the passages which I have omitted from the list; but the similarities call for an explanation. Riposati might profitably have compared the

topic *ab adiunctis* with such passages as that in the *Ad Herennium* and looked for its source in rhetorical theory (and the comparable theory of method in medicine) rather than in the supposed speculations of the later Peripatetics.

PHILLIP DE LACY

Washington University

*The Greater Roman Historians.* By M. L. W. LAISTNER. ("Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. XXI.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947. Pp. x+196. \$3.00.

This little volume gives even more than the title promises. It discusses not only the greater Roman historians but also their background, including the Hellenistic background. Thus it has become a general account of Roman historiography, approaching it both as literature and as history. It fills a gap of long standing, and does so remarkably well. Obviously, the account is short, but there is an astonishing amount of material compressed into it, and it is so interestingly written that it will have a broad appeal.

"Challenging" is a trite word but probably the one which best describes Laistner's presentation. Concerning the early annalists, he remarks that "the whole problem has been thoroughly bedevilled by the 'Quellenforscher'; we shall meet it again in aggravated form when we consider historians like Livy and Tacitus" (p. 23). A remark in Schanz-Hosius on Livy and Valerius Antias draws the comment that "it would be difficult to cram more nonsense into one sentence" (p. 172, n. 4). Again, the *Augustan History* "is by all odds the most contemptible work in all Latin literature" (p. 142). Those who are offended by such statements may like to locate obvious mistakes but will find few. One is the statement that Piso, the annalist, had been consul in 149 B.C. (p. 29). Actually, in that year he sponsored the Lex Calpurnia, while he was consul in 133 (cf. Münzer and Cichorius, *RE*, s.v. "Calpurnius" [96]). The statement that the *History of Alexander* by Cleitarchus "laid the foundation for that sensational and semilegendary account of the Conqueror's life and achievements which passed to later writers like Curtius" (p. 7) may now be considered incorrect but cannot be held against the author, for Tarn's *Alexander the Great* had not yet been published when Laistner wrote. Moreover, back of the author's trenchant style is a reasonable and well-balanced interpretation with the cutting remarks aimed only at excesses. For instance, in spite of the criticism of the abuse of source analysis, Laistner himself notices the extensive use of Polybius by Livy in the fourth and fifth

decades (p. 84) and, what is more, remarks that there are in Livy "repetitions and duplications . . . whereby essentially the same set of events is related twice over and treated as two episodes occurring at different dates" (p. 92). Thus there is no quarrel with the spirit in which the work is written, but there may be disagreements about interpretations.

A few brief quotations will indicate the author's general interpretation. "Sallust's merits as an artist have obscured, or made his readers willing to forget, his faults. As a historical authority he is at best in the second rank" (p. 63). After a similar statement about Tacitus we find: "His chief weakness is just this: that the satirist runs away time and again with the historian. . . . For breadth of view, for his general conception of what historical writing should be, and the manner in which he gave practical expression to it, perhaps also for a more deeply rooted *humanitas*, the first place among Roman historians belongs to Livy" (p. 139). This judgment will probably be accepted by all who actually have used the two historians extensively in research. Possibly Laistner may have overrated Livy's workmanship, but disagreement on this point involves only a matter of emphasis and shades of opinion and cannot be discussed here. On the other hand, Laistner is right in defending Livy against the charge of complete lack of historical criticism, in spite of the weakness of his treatment of the causes and outbreak of the Second Punic War and several other problems. He is right also in claiming considerable merit for Livy's reconstruction of early Roman history (pp. 91-94), but it should be treated as only a reconstruction, with no special claim to credence. I disagree definitely with the implication of the following sentence: "It is also legitimate to doubt whether the interpretations of Roman history put forward by Cicero and Livy, after every allowance has been made for their literary eminence, would have been generally accepted, if they had had little or no basis in fact" (p. 93). Moreover, I believe that Livy had a better understanding of the fragility of his own reconstruction than is normally believed. It is true that his remarks in his Preface concerning the incredibility of early Roman history applies only to the period be-

fore the founding of the city, but vi. 1. 1-4 clearly implies that much down to the sack of Rome by the Gauls is obscure and that more accurate history begins only after this event. It is natural to wonder whether the statement concerning more accurate history is not a mere corollary of the story about the destruction of records by the Gauls. At any rate, Livy makes his famous observation concerning the corruption of history by funeral orations and lying inscriptions on family busts (viii. 40, quoted pp. 86 f.) in connection with events of 322 B.C. and so suggests that he has little more faith in the accuracy of the history of the latter part of the fourth century than in that of the earlier period.

But enough of such carping. In general, Livy has been correctly placed, thus giving a proper perspective to Roman historiography. Moreover, a great service has been rendered in giving deserved recognition to the merits of Ammianus Marcellinus. Now with E. A. Thompson's recent book<sup>1</sup> and Laistner's appreciation, Ammianus has begun to come into his own. Very important is the suggestion that the style of Ammianus is not the result of the fact that Latin was a foreign language to him but that Ammianus had had a sound training in Latin rhetoric and wrote in a manner admired in his own day (pp. 146-48). All in all, an extremely welcome and valuable book.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

*Troy and Her Legend.* By ARTHUR M. YOUNG.  
Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press,  
1948. Pp. xvi+194.

In this book Mr. Young has undertaken the tremendous task of tracing the influence of the legend of Troy in literature and the arts from Homer to the twentieth century. It would seem almost incredible that such a vast subject could be covered with any measure of scholarly and literary success in the brief compass of 174 pages. (We are not told why the work is confined to such narrow limits.) Yet Mr. Young has succeeded remarkably well in presenting the main outlines of the long and

varied history of the legend. The book is a masterpiece of compression and only rarely and briefly approaches the style of a catalogue. Although factual material naturally occupies most of the space, criticism and interpretation are not neglected.

There are six chapters: i, "The Legend of Troy"; ii, "In Homer and in the Cyclic Poets"; iii, "In Literature"; iv, "In Painting, Ceramics, and Tapestry"; v, "In Sculpture and on Gems and Coins"; vi, "In Opera." Obviously, no man can hope to be an authority in all these fields, and the specialist will undoubtedly find faults of omission and commission. But, in general, Mr. Young's statements of fact are correct, so far as I have been able to check them, and his critical remarks are sound and helpful.

Chapter i begins with an account of the character of the legend. "The greatness of the Troy legend lies rather in the beauty and the variety it has called out of the creative imaginations of artists, from Homer down to modern times . . ." (p. 1). The rest of the chapter is a summary of the familiar story according to what seems to have been the orthodox version of antiquity.

The first paragraph of chapter ii summarizes in eighteen lines the contents of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. For those who have even a sketchy knowledge of the poems this paragraph is unnecessary; for those who have no knowledge of them, it will be almost meaningless. There follows a rather full (pp. 9-19) and appreciative statement of the eternal poetic and human values of Homer's work. This is one of the best sections of the book. The chapter closes with a short but adequate account of the cyclic epics.

Chapter iii describes the history of the legend in European literature since the time of Homer. The chapter contains also the one outstanding example of faulty emphasis and arrangement. The author is discussing Greek lyric poetry. Mention of Stesichorus leads to a reference to the Trojan Tablet (*tabula Iliaca*). Thereupon Mr. Young digresses from his subject for nearly two precious pages (pp. 27-28) to give us a detailed description of this minor monument. The *tabula Iliaca* is treated again in its proper place (chap. v, p. 145), where it

<sup>1</sup> *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, 1947); cf. the review by Laistner, *CP*, XLIII (1948), 205-7.



receives over half a page—surely, all it deserves. The rest of the chapter is a well-balanced and very readable account of the subject. Naturally, Vergil, Dictys, Dares, and Benoît de Sainte-Maure receive the most attention. The treatment of Vergil (pp. 37-41) is especially good.

The first section of chapter iv deals with ancient painting. The lost art of Polygnotus is discussed at some length (pp. 86-90), while the extant paintings, such as those found at Pompeii, are merely listed catalogue-fashion. Perhaps that is all they merit artistically, but that is not the point. The other subjects considered in this chapter are: Greek ceramics (pp. 94-105), illuminated manuscripts of Homer and Vergil (pp. 105-7), painting, chiefly of the Renaissance (pp. 107-18), tapestry (pp. 118-26), neoclassical school of painting, especially in France (pp. 126-32), Wedgwood pottery (pp. 132-35), modern painting (pp. 135-39). Under each of these titles Mr. Young has given us an interesting and instructive little essay which will serve at least as an introduction to the subject.

Chapter v continues in the same manner with brief essays on the legend of Troy in ancient sculpture, on ancient gems, on ancient coins, and in modern sculpture.

In Chapter vi the great popularity of the stories about Troy in the early days of the opera is rightly stressed. The pertinent works of Gluck, Berlioz, Offenbach, Goldmark, Saint-Saëns and Richard Strauss are briefly described and in most cases fairly evaluated.

The book contains twenty-five illustrations, most of them good. Apparently, they were chosen, in part at least, to bring out the great variety of forms in which the legend has found artistic expression. It would have aided the convenience of the reader if the illustrations had all been collected in one place, or if each one had been placed near the passage where it is discussed.

Not the least interesting part of the book are the brief notes which follow the text (pp. 175-87). These notes are especially welcome, since they make up, to some extent, for the lack of a bibliography.

There is an index (pp. 189-94), but it is far

from complete. Apparently it was designed to list the more important proper names.

I noted only a few trifling errors. On page 14 for "effront" read "affront." There are several commas that I regard with suspicion, particularly the one on page 142, fourth line from the bottom, after "Menelaus." On page 151 we might accept 480 B.C. as a round number for the date of "the expulsion of the Persians," but we cannot accept 332 B.C. as the date of "the accession of Alexander."

The book is well and attractively bound and beautifully printed on paper of fine quality. In these days of high prices for poor materials and shoddy workmanship it is a genuine pleasure to congratulate the University of Pittsburgh Press and its printers on the excellence of their achievements.

MAURICE W. AVERY

Williams College

*Swans and Amber: Some Early Greek Lyrics Freely Translated and Adapted.* By DOROTHY BURR THOMPSON. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948. Pp. xii+193. \$2.75.

Perhaps, through time's inscrutable arrangement, the present moment is at last the most propitious one in which to translate Greek lyric; for the best modern poetry has set a standard of simplicity in diction which no earlier age in English literature seems to have provided. Not only are the proper atmosphere and language at hand. A person can no longer conceive of the ornate gentility which once passed for translation from the Greek. Even Symonds, who served Sappho and other Greek poets so admirably in his day, could not now win a worthy imitator. It is true that not much good translation from Greek lyric has yet appeared; but there are signs of an eager stirring in that part of the library where Bergk and Hiller-Crusius are shelved.

This book is one of them. Mrs. Thompson comes properly by her controlled enthusiasm for the Greeks, since she was educated at Bryn Mawr; and it was for students in fine arts at the University of Toronto that her poems were written. Her title is taken with poetic aptness from Lucian's queer little story about the poplars of Eridanus and the swans of that river; by its help the translator hopes

to escape too stern a judgment of her offerings, in the spirit in which Lucian sadly reflected "how often modern writers are expected to produce the swans and amber of story," which he did not find.

One hundred twenty-five poems, most of them very brief, are here collected from seventeen authors, Callinus to Bacchylides; nine folk songs are added for good measure. Each section—"The Eastern Greeks," "Greeks of the Cyclades," "The Western Greeks," "Greeks of the Mainland"—is introduced by a simply written historical sketch. Appropriate illustrations, freely drawn from vase paintings of the period by Winifred McCulloch, are scattered strategically through the handsome little volume: they set a style in grace and beauty which should be followed by other translators, although they may not be so fortunate as Mrs. Thompson in knowing Greek art professionally as the one-time director of the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology. Bright maps of the Mediterranean form the end-papers.

The idiom is as sharp and taut as any modern poet could wish, with no flourishes or sentimental betrayals of the original. Greek lyric is stripped so bare of words that it is all too easy to say too much in a translation. Rhyme, if anything, may be Mrs. Thompson's occasional Nemesis; Callinus 1 (in stately elegiacs) is not best reproduced in short rhymed lines of three accents each. The same is true for Mimnermus on love. Although it is possible to defend rhyme on the ground that it is the English equivalent of the Greek metrical restrictions, I could wish that the translator had now and then thrown rhyme away and done the job in free verse. It is obvious how treacherous rhyme can be, even with the simple couplet. It is the sense, however, that comes through which is of most importance, and this is usually quite accurate. In Hipponax 61 (all numbers refer to the Loeb volumes) I miss the very specific *thirty* minae of silver. In Theognis *βαρηχθεις*, "breast-plated" with wine, is completely lost—a hard word to keep in any case. And I like as well as Mrs. Thompson's the swinging version of Archilochus 58 which I found long ago in the *Golden Book Magazine*:

A long-legged straddling giant is not my choice  
for a chief—

Curled and haughty and shaven, a proper  
sort of a beau;

Give me a bow-legged bantam, stout if his body  
is brief,

Firm on his feet, quick-witted, full of spirit  
and go.

To make matters right, I quote Mrs. Thompson's "To a Lover" (*Love Songs*, No. 41), surely the very earliest *aubade* in all European literature:

What ails you? O, I beg, do not betray

Us! Ere my husband comes, please run away—

Lest he should hurt me, miserable soul!

It's dawn! Look, through the window, see the  
day?

Add 143 after Archilochus 94; and note, in passing, that the Greek inscriptions beside the drawings are words from the poems opposite which they stand.

Triumphs appear in the translations of Xenophanes 1, more compact than the original and omitting the last six otiose lines; Aleman "On Night" (36), the best translation since Goethe; Theognis 237, with its rhyme making it doubly attractive, regardless of what I say of rhyme in general; the Rhodian "Swallow Song" (our American "tricks or treats" at Halloween!) in the rhythm of "Sing a Song of Six Pence"; and the Samian "Eiresione," with its (in the Greek) somewhat unaggressive close: the children intend no blackmail, after all. Sappho, the true test of the lyric translator, comes off well, even for one with the echoes of Swinburne, Rossetti, Symonds, and Wharton's chaste prose in his ear.

Most of the pieces have never been done before; this fact is a recommendation for the volume, since these new versions are done so well. The Greek Anthology has been much ransacked; a large corpus of excellent translation exists for it. But Greek lyric, a far more important genre, has been unduly and unaccountably neglected by translators. Nor is difficulty of language the hazard except in Pindar. Now that Mrs. Thompson has shown the way, I hope she and other translators will give us more swans and amber.

L. R. LIND

University of Kansas

*Tertulliani De anima*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by J. H. WASZINK. Amsterdam: J. M. Meulenhoff, 1947. Pp. xii+1\*-49\*+1-651.

In 1933 Waszink brought out an edition of the *De anima* with an introduction, translation (into German), and commentary; and, two years later, an index "uerborum et locutionum." He now promises, in addition to the present expanded edition, discussions of the clausulae and of other topics, to appear in *Vigiliae Christianae* and *Mnemosyne*. The text does not differ notably from that of 1933; it would be no cause for confidence if it did. But the Introduction and Commentary have been rewritten entirely, on an enlarged scale, and we now have an edition of the *De anima* fit to be set beside the finest critical and exegetical work, comparable with Munro's *Lucretius* or J. B. Mayor's *De natura deorum*, a worthy representative of Dutch scholarship at its best and a mine of information that will serve well all who may have occasion to turn to Tertullian's *De anima* for any of the many aspects in which that many-sided work is in point—and these range from large questions in the history of religion and philosophy to nice distinctions in Latin grammar. Elaborate indexes make it easy to find the appropriate places in both text and comment. The Bibliography, also elaborate, is classified—a great gain over a merely alphabetical listing. If Waszink has read all the items that he mentions, then he has succeeded, to judge from his citations, in sifting the grain from a good deal of chaff. Nothing seems to have been overlooked, unless it is Souter's work (on the *Apologeticum*) of 1926—only the edition of J. E. B. Mayor, to which Souter furnished a translation (1917), is actually named.

The introductory matter contains the commonplace, but in Waszink acutely critical, enumeration of authorities for the text and interpretation; a discussion of the date of composition ("between the years 210 and 213"), of the occasion for Tertullian's writing this work, and of its relation to his lost *De censu animae* of earlier date; an analysis of the argument; a careful exploration of Tertullian's sources in the *De anima*, and especially his use of the *περὶ ψυχῆς* of Soranus,<sup>1</sup> the *Vetusta*

*placita*, and the *Ἀπέκροντα* [Aëtius]; and a brief estimate of the influences of *De anima* on later writers—much smaller than might have been supposed.

The text is accompanied by a full apparatus that reports both the meager manuscript tradition (even supplemented by the testimony of early editions that represent independent lines) and the conjectures of editors and annotators. Waszink's own text is "conservative," with short shrift given in the commentary to many of the guesses of his predecessors, less on textual grounds as such than on the basis of a clear analysis of the argument or of Latin usage (e.g., pp. 87-89 on *inuiscatas* . . . *palmas gestiens* . . . *uindicans* cap. 1. 3). Thus he defends the tradition at 43. 5 and 46. 7. Changes of his own are far and few between (e.g., 20. 5, 23. 2—the justification of *despectrices*, pp. 299-300, is a model of cogent reasoning, 24. 9), and he is not above withdrawing his own earlier proposals (e.g., 4. 1).

A critical review of Waszink's commentary would run to many pages. He has gathered together practically all the extant ancient testimony and all the modern discussions that can be brought to bear on the many problems that nearly every sentence of Tertullian presents, and usually he reaches a definite conclusion for himself, uniting sound good sense with learning and acumen. Though his commentary is prone to assume that disproportion to which the mere accumulation of opinion as well as of evidence tends, it has life enough to keep it from being a desert of annotation surrounding an oasis of text, and it is seldom that anything is left entirely up in the air. The page and a half of argument about the *Fata scribunda* (39. 2) is disappointing, but perhaps the disappointment is inescapable. If, as Waszink suggests, the "form *Fata Scribunda* owes its existence to Varro," much of the argument is idle, and certainly the contention (of Wissowa,

<sup>1</sup> I notice that Waszink habitually prints *κρίσις* (δόξα), e.g., pp. 35\*, 459 (three times, once *xvp.*). On p. ix (l. 12) for texts read text; 44\* for § 4 read § 3 (unless a caption is missing on p. 38\*); among other slips I have noted: p. 346, l. 3, from below, for come read become; p. 432, l. 8, from below, discrimination (l) sc. discrimination; p. 444, l. 12, for scribunda read scribunda; p. 490, l. 6, from below, for quæst. read quæst. P. 641, Dative: substituted by Genit.—No, but genitive substituted for dative.

quoted by Waszink) that the name cannot be so old as the use of *scribunda* instead of *scribentia* seems to infer. For by the time of Varro assimilation and associative interference had obscured older distinctions of meaning between *gerund* and *gerundive*. Just as *in gerendo bellum* gave way to *in bello gerendo*, so *Fata scribundo* (which, in fact, Junius proposed to read), under the influence of the adjectives in *-bundo-*, give way to *F. scribunda*, a shift resisted in the legal formula *scribendo adesse*.

Tertullian's readiness to enrich the vocabulary of Latin with new formations vies in interest with his subject matter, e.g., *anuloculter*, the name of an obstetrical implement used to procure abortion—this apropos of the argument whether or no the embryo has a soul. Waszink has summoned a formidable array of learned comment—from medicine, philosophy, archeology, and grammar—in order to elucidate in every detail this interesting chapter in what has come to be mis-known as "the earliest Christian psychology." But there is no page of his commentary that does not yield something of interest and value.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Mana: Introduction à l'histoire des religions*, Vol. II: *Les Religions de l'Europe ancienne*; Part III: *Les Religions étrusque et romaine* (A. GRENIER); *Les Religions des Celtes* (J. VENDRYES), *des Germains* (E. TONNELAT), *et des anciens Slaves* (B.-O. UNBEGAUN). Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1948. Pp. 467. Fr. 500.

Not one of these four authors, if I mistake not, would claim to be a specialist in the history of religions. There, no doubt, lies one reason for a sense of dissatisfaction that this volume gives. Another is the lack of extensive documents, such as the history of a vanished religion demands if it is to be written with assurance and conviction and such as exist for only one of the five religions with which the volume deals. For Germanic religion there is not, when you come to it, really much more than lists of names of gods and goddesses, known to us at second hand, together with a

few scraps of information about ritual, cult, and belief. Etruscan is in no better case, for want of a sure knowledge of the language. And all that can be put together by Unbegaun on the religion of the early Slavonic peoples fills fewer than seventy pages of the entire book. Tonnelat has taken sixty-three; more might have been made of the Germanic divine names of the Rhineland alone, which are passed over in almost complete silence. The Etruscans are dismissed in seventy-nine pages, Keltic religion in about the same number. It has the advantage of more complete documentation, and Vendryes' sure command of his materials and clarity of exposition make his contribution easily the best. Grenier's are marred by an unduly large number of trivial errors of citation and by the slighting (pp. 88-89, 93) of evidence from the dialect sources which are both pertinent and illuminating, not merely the Oscan and Umbrian texts, but also (for example) the inscribed Magrè stags' horns (on which now see Kretschmer in *Die Sprache*, I [1949], 31-36) or the famous Ateste dedications. These are not recent discoveries, but it appears that we must await another Wissowa before they find their way into the handbooks. Not that Grenier is totally unaware (p. 181) of the existence of the Iguvine tables; but these were not deciphered first (*premier déchiffrement*) by Bréal, but by Auffrecht and Kirchhoff.

10. Add K. Olzscha, *Interpretation der Agrarermumienbinde* (*Klio*, Beiheft 40, N.F. 27 [1939]). Insert ? after *préindo-européennes*.

11. Miss Lake, not Kirsopp Agnes, if you please, in the *Memoirs of the American Academy*.

13. O. Müller, revised by W. Deecke, not O. Müller-Deecke; Brandenstein, not Brandstein.

14. Cf. 26. Hrozný, not Hrosny.

15. For the Etruscans in Tiras (Gen. 10:2) see Quispal, *St. etr.*, XIV (1940), 411 (*An. phil.* XV [1940-41], 141).

26. On *Tages* add Serv. A. i. 2.

29. Cf. 51. H. J. Rose, not J. H. or (53, twice) J. Rose (so 126).

32. Holzapfel, not Hotzapfel.

45. (Cf. 130.) The curious feature of Vertumnus, uncertainty of sex (Prop. iv. 2. 19-24), should be mentioned; on this now see W. Muster, "Der Schamanismus bei den Etruskern," in Brandenstein's *Frühgeschichte und Sprachwissen-*

*schafft*, I (1948), 70. This may well be the real explanation of the name, and *uertens annus* (Prop. *op. cit.* 11) merely popular etymology.

54. Anc(h)aria (and also, perhaps Angerona, pp. 109, 133). Cf. Etr. *ancar*, "wealth, riches" (Fiesel, *Language*, XI [1935], 125). The gentile name (cf. English *Rich*) is a derivative of the Etruscan common noun.

83. *Faunus* is now generally connected with *Daurus*, cf. *θαῦρον θήριον* (Hesych.), Walde-Hofmann, I, 468. (On *flāmen* see *ibid.*, p. 512, where the equation with *brahmān-*, here confidently accepted at p. 92 [cf. p. 181], is controverted.)

85. The date of the Rg-Veda is much more remote than the sixth century B.C.

101. On *sororia* (*Iuno*) see H. J. Rose, *Mnemosyne*, N.S., LIII (1925), 406-14.

123. Not *Aus italischen* (nor, p. 181, *Aus römischen*), but *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* is the title of Norden's last book.

128. Osc. *kerriat*, *kerriais*, mean "cereali, cerealibus." The Oscan for "Cererī" is *kerri*.

129. The month *flusare* was not the Oscan April but the Vestinian July (*CIL*, IX, 3513).

152. On *nouensides* see now Wagenvoort, *Roman Dynamism*, pp. 83-84.

153. For the correct reading of *CIL*, I, 632, see Elizabeth C. Evans, *Cults of the Sabine Territory* (1939) (a work cited, I think, by Grenier somewhere), p. 70. The meaningless *promiserat* is Mommsen's conjecture; and the actual original of the *insec.* is extant at Rieti, as we now know, thanks to Miss Evans.

After all this I gave up reading. Even Vendryes' pages are not free from error (p. 259: Zwickler, not Berlin 1934 but i [Berlin, 1934], ii-iii [Bonn, 1935-36]; 268: the nominative of *Cicollui* is not *Cicolluis*, as Holder gives it, but *Cicollus* [Thurneysen, *ZfCPH*, XX (1936), 379]).

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Albinos Epitome*. Edited by PIERRE LOUIS. Paris: "Les belles lettres," 1945. Pp. xxxii+185.

In 1937 R. E. Witt published a monograph on *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* which showed, among other things, to what kind of centrifugal tendencies the Platonic legacy had fallen victim before it was reorganized and reunified by the philosophic genius of

a Plotinus. Witt was by that time also prepared to meet the long-felt need for a new edition of the *Epitome* (also called *Didaskalikos*), but circumstances prevented the publication of his text. In the meantime Pierre Louis applied himself to this task and, after publishing in *Rev. ét. gr.* of 1942 (pp. 70 ff.) a list of manuscripts, has now come forward with a new edition. The war made it impossible for him to collate the old and presumably important Vind. ph. gr. 314; whether other manuscripts that are mentioned in the preliminary survey of 1942 were discarded after examination or were inaccessible for the same reason as the Vindobonensis is not quite clear to me. Of those collated, some were found to derive from Laur. 95. 9 and were therefore dismissed. I wonder, however, why Louis does include in his *apparatus* the readings of two Parisini and one Laurentianus, although he puts forward ingenious and convincing arguments to the effect that Paris. 1962 is their ancestor.

Whether a study of further manuscripts will lead to a revision of the *stemma codicum* on page xxvi and whether it will bring to light valuable new readings is more than I can say. Yet the text can certainly be improved by emendation. Louis himself has emended a number of passages; among his ventures, 14. 1. 1, *τὰ μὲν δὴ σώματα συνιστάς* (*eis tās or eis tās MSS*) stands out as particularly successful. He also has incorporated some suggestions of Pierre Chantraine. Yet the text calls for more. It is hardly credible that a man so versed in the subject of syllogisms should have left a hypothetical syllogism at 6. 6. 15 without a conclusion (add *οὐ ταῦτόν ἔρα ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπίστασθαι τῷ ἀναμνησκεισθαι*) or should have skipped a premise at 5. 5. 18 (*τὸ αὐτοκίνητον δὲ <ἀεκίνητον, ἀεκίνητον δὲ> ψυχῇ*). In the latter paragraph I think that the sense requires a further change; we read that if we wish to support a "hypothesis" we must go back to more basic propositions, *ὥς ἂν ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τι* (*τὸ MSS*) *πρῶτον καὶ ὁμολογούμενον* (5. 5. 9). At 10. 1. 5 the *νοητά* exist *μετοχῇ πρῶτων τινῶν [τῶν]<sup>1</sup> νοητῶν*. In 16. 2. 1, *ἐπεὶ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ὡς συγγενε-*

<sup>1</sup> Delete *τῶν* also at 19. 2. 9, *τοῖς* at 27. 4. 1, *τὰ* at 28. 4. 7; add *τῶν* at 12. 1. 1 after *καὶ*. At 15. 3. 5 γῆ *ἵς* *ἔσσαν* *τι καὶ αὐτῇ* (*αὐτῇ* edd.). At 19. 5. 12 we need a gen. plur., *ἀδρομερεστέρων*, instead of *ἀδρομερίστερον*.



στάτου θεοῖς πάλοι (πάλιν MSS) φροντὶς ἦν τῷ πατρὶ πάντων . . . ; *ibid.* 7: τὰ πάθη ἀπὸ σώματος προσφύσεται θνητοῦ (θνητά MSS). At 28. 3. 5, ὡφελίας ἀρχὴ τὸ ἀγαθόν, τοῦτο δ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἡρτήται (εἴρηται MSS). At 10. 4. 2, neither anything bad nor anything good can be an accident (συμβεβηκός) for the god; κατὰ μετοχὴν γὰρ τιнос ἔσται <τοι> οὗτος (scil. ἀγαθός) καὶ μάλιστα ἀγαθότητος. At 12. 1. 12, the Cosmos was created after the pattern of an Idea of the Cosmos, ὑπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ . . . κατὰ θαυμασιωτάτην πρόνοιαν καὶ δαίταν ἐλθόντος ἐπὶ τὸ δημιουργεῖν τὸν κόσμον, διότι ἀγαθός ἦν. It does not help to translate δαίτα by "la règle." Albinus may have written καὶ δι<καιοτάτην> αἰτ<ι>αν. At 23. 1. 6, the gods in *Timaeus* place the divine part of the soul [ἐπὶ] τοῦ σώματος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰον ἀκροπόλεως, whereas (17. 4. 7) τὸ παθητικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς κατωτέρω ἐποίησαν (οἰκεῖν). At 25. 5. 4, the ἄλογοι ψυχαὶ ἀρεΐλῃ τε <τῇ> φαντασίᾳ ἐλαυνόμεναι . . . καὶ οἱ, probably better, ψιλῇ τῇ φ. At 31. 2. 8, education is more likely to do its work ἔθελον ἀστείους than ἥθελον (cf. 32. 4. 10).

The new edition provides *subsidia interpretationis* by indicating below the French translation the Platonic and Aristotelian passages on which Albinus' account of Plato's system is based. Such references are, in fact, indispensable. As one would expect of a scholar who has proved his intimate acquaintance with Plato's work, the references are, on the whole, correct and pertinent. The full extent of Aristotle's influence on Albinus is, however, not brought out; Witt's helpful observations and suggestions are ignored. We may also recall that Willy Theiler in his review of Witt's book (*Gnomon*, XV [1939], 105) demanded that editors of Albinus should supply references to Varro, Areius Didymus, Apuleius (*De Platone*), and various other authors who are representative of, or take a friendly interest in, Middle Platonism.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSSEN

Cornell University

In this brief monograph, the substance of a lecture delivered before the Joint Classical Meetings at Oxford in August, 1948, Professor Boëthius returns once more to a familiar theme in an effort to disentangle the Greek, the Italic, and the Roman strands in the stout cord of classical civilization, particularly as manifested in town-planning and domestic architecture. In this, as in his previous studies, the author has brought to bear his close knowledge both of the sites and of the scattered literary evidence.

Boëthius stresses the greater significance of ethnic tendencies as against the occurrence of specific forms in Italic or Greek lands. Thus he is prepared to grant the eastern origin of the atrium complex and even to accept Haverfield's opinion that the conception of an orderly town plan passed from the Greek to the Italic world, but he maintains that it was the dominantly authoritarian and hieratic cast of Roman society that led to the stereotyped axial symmetry which marked the development of the atrium house type and the *cardo-decumanus* scheme in town-planning as practiced by the Romans.

In the realm of domestic architecture Boëthius finds a more basic divergence between the Greek and the Roman not only in house types but also in the relation between business and residential property. The *insula*, the great apartment block in all its minor variations, is to be regarded as a distinctively Roman development, evolving out of congeries of *tabernae* with dwelling-rooms above, most likely in the *Urbs* itself, the process accelerated by the invention of concrete but inspired fundamentally by an inborn Italic tendency for the businessman to live as close as possible to his place of business, whether above it or beside it. In Greece and the Greek East, on the other hand, business tended to concentrate more exclusively around the agora, or bazaar, while the citizens lived in fairly homogeneous residential districts consisting of one-family houses of modest size and seldom more than two stories in height.

These two traditions, the Roman and the Greek, which are now beginning to emerge with fair clarity from the ancient evidence, are traced by Boëthius down to the present day in

*Roman and Greek Town Architecture.* By AXEL BOËTHIUS. ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," Vol. LIV [1948], No. 3) Göteborg. Kr. 5.

the Mediterranean world and western Europe. The dividing line, in general, runs northeast-southwest through southern Italy, the Greek tendencies being curiously strong in North Africa, while the Roman were carried eastward in late days by Venetians and Genoese to such outposts as Corfu.

Such, then, in briefest outline is the logical and plausible picture built up by the author. Yet, even when all the available material is amassed, digested, and controlled with Boëthius' skill, the reader feels that the evidence is still dangerously weak to support a firm decision on many points of major importance. How, for instance, can we be sure of the way men lived in large commercial centers of the Hellenistic East until we learn more of the residential areas of Peiraeus, Alexandria, and early Antioch? The close study of the Antiochene house type now promised by Richard Stillwell may help somewhat, although the known houses are of the imperial period and many of them were suburban villas. In Italy, too, many more sites both large and small need to be explored and studied as townsites so that we may avoid the embarrassing danger of relying too exclusively on Rome, Ostia, and the Campanian cities, all of which were exceptional in one way or another. Here, too, we may count on early help from the further exploration of Cosa (in both its Etruscan and its Roman phases) so auspiciously commenced last year by the American Academy in Rome. No less rewarding will be the deeper and more critical exploration now in progress on the old familiar sites, such as Rome, Ostia, and Pompeii, on the one hand, and Athens and Corinth, on the other. All these cities were exposed over long periods of time to influences from both East and West which resulted in rich cultural amalgams. With the help of a sharp spade, a sharper eye, and infinite patience, it should be possible to trace the process of fusion and to isolate the component elements. In the meantime we shall all be stimulated and our thinking directed by such penetrating syntheses as this of Professor Boëthius.

HOMER A. THOMPSON

*Institute for Advanced Study  
Princeton*

*The Classical Background of English Literature.*

By J. A. K. THOMSON. New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. 272. \$3.50.

The day of the best influence of the classics ought, as we know, to be now and in the immediate future, now that an advanced historical insight has made available a better idea of antiquity. The student of classical influences upon the past must be largely concerned with erroneous views and vagaries of emphasis—with "Aristotelianism" rather than with Aristotle; with the "Pindaric ode" rather than with Pindar; seldom with Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes; more often with Lucian and Plutarch, with Heliodorus and Longus, with Neo-Platonism, with Ovid, Lucan, and Statius, Valerius Maximus, Pliny's *Natural History*, Seneca, Macrobius, Boethius; and generally more with Latin literature than with Greek. This situation is very deftly handled by Professor Thomson in the first part of his book, a sketch of ancient literature for the benefit of students of English, in which he brings out the more influential authors, yet keeps them where they belong in a good perspective. He proceeds by literary types, grouping under each its Greek and Roman representatives—a method justified not only by its concision and clarity but because, since the Renaissance, the types have been almost as substantially active as the authors. The absence here of Lucretius, whose influence is not negligible, should perhaps be queried; and one may wish that Suetonius had at least been named, for the sake of the anecdotal type of biography, and also Valerius Maximus, to whom the Middle Ages gave undue attention.

The second part of the book surveys the classical influence upon English literature from the Middle Ages to the present day. The method is to describe the character of the influence in successive periods and to dwell upon a few important and representative authors. This, too, is a good procedure; and the writer, who has read for himself and pondered the authors he deals with, has much to say that is just and illuminating. At the same time, it must be owned that this very self-reliance tends to diminish the value of the book, in a field that is too well worked to admit of impro-

visation. For example, the few and inadequate remarks on rhetoric ignore the studies that have been devoted to this omnipresent element in the classical background. Classical mythology, alike omnipresent, is passed over, and the author loses in his general perspective from not knowing the work of Osgood, Root, and Douglas Bush. The importance of Continental intermediaries is acknowledged but not always realized; various allusions to Chapman indicate that his classical learning is accepted at face value despite the work of Franck L. Schoell; nothing is said of the "battle" between ancients and moderns. We may doubt if the dismissal of those who think that Shakespeare made use of what Latin he knew (p. 187) implies that Thomson has studied and refuted the work of T. W. Baldwin; nor do his remarks on the sources of *Lucrece* suggest that he has consulted the evidence assembled in the new Variorum edition. The paragraph (p. 197) on Milton's *Samson* is more superficial than is tolerable since the appearance of William R. Parker's study. Omissions may be justified by the need of compression; but compression is carried to a fault when it excludes virtually all that is characteristic of the seventeenth century apart from Milton, who is given to the "Renaissance," and Dryden, assigned to the "Eighteenth Century." A severe definition of "literature" may rule out divines and political writers and the Cambridge Platonists but should still leave space for the Caroline lyric: Herrick is not mentioned, and nowhere is anything said of the influence of Catullus, though more than one book (Emperor; Peek) has dealt with it.

The student of English literature, benevolently contemplated in the Preface, will find here an attractively written book, skilfully put together, and will hardly find elsewhere a better general characterization of classical influence from age to age. He may still wish, however, for a survey that will go deeper in relating these influences and their changes to the history of culture and that in detail and in emphasis will be more abreast of recent studies.

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

*Hellas: A Short History of Ancient Greece.* By C. E. ROBINSON. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1948. Pp. 201+14 pls. + text. illus. \$3.00.

This short history of Greece is designed primarily for popular reading and should serve such a purpose very well. The book covers the course of Greek history from Minoan-Mycenaean times to the death of Alexander and has a general chapter on the Hellenistic period. The author, however, has laid his main emphasis on the fifth century, so that the core of the work is a good summary of Periclean Athens. The book is well written, and its interest is added to by a well-chosen series of quotations from Greek authors to illustrate the manners and thought of a period. The latter are stressed rather more than the narrative history, but provision is made for further interest in the narrative by references to the writer's previous *History of Greece*. The volume is attractively bound and well set up, with a good selection of plates and figures in the text; the latter are taken mostly from red-figured vases and are chosen to illustrate manners, costumes, and physical types. The chief fault of the "mechanics" is a lack of care in the proofreading or the final typesetting, which has resulted in some misspellings and running-together of words.

Generally speaking, the balance given to various topics is good and the interpretations sound or, at least, defensible. For example, the sections on the formation of the polis and the evaluation of fifth-century democracy, in which its faults are not minimized, are well treated. The greatest defect in interpretation, to the reviewer at least, seems to be a slighting and misunderstanding of the forces working toward Pan-Hellenism and such practical forms as political unity achieved in Greece. The treatment of cultural unity at the end of the archaic period is slighted, and the unity of effort in the Persian Wars is not given its full weight. This has resulted, in particular, in an inadequate presentation of the political thought of the fourth century and a failure to understand the more constructive political efforts made both by the Greek states and by Philip II: the attempts to establish a *koine*

*airene* are not mentioned; Demosthenes' efforts to form a coalition, which were reasonably successful, are dismissed too lightly; and no appreciation is shown of Philip's attempt to work with the half-conscious tendencies of the Greeks toward federations and wider political organizations and of his understanding of Greek political forms. Perhaps this is asking rather too much of a book in which the polis and its thought are necessarily emphasized, but to a modern popular audience the fourth century would seem to be just as important as the fifth century, if not more so—perspectives have changed since Grote wrote on Periclean democracy.

There are, of course, some statements made which, to say the least, are open to argument; but errors of fact are comparatively few, and another fault of popular writing—exaggeration for the sake of making a point—is not very frequent. To single out some points to which objection might be raised: Minoan commercial and political importance seems exaggerated in the light of recent studies; the Phoenician alphabet would scarcely have been adopted by Ionian Greece *ca.* 1000 B.C.; trade as a motive in early colonization seems unduly emphasized; it is stated (p. 172) that the dead were "invariably burned" in Greece in the classical period. Finally, we meet this ill-advised statement (p. 187): "the Greeks would have had little enough to learn from a people [the Romans] whose favorite form of punishment was crucifixion and whose idea of spreading culture was to erect provincial amphitheaters for repulsive scenes of carnage."

The author does, however, present an acceptable and well-developed view of the function of the classical spirit, summarized by him in the words, "Look to the End" and by his stress on the unity present in Greek thought.

CARL ROEBUCK

University of Chicago

*Laryngeal before Sonant.* By L. L. HAMMERICH. ("Det kgl. danske Videnskabernes Selskab: historisk-filologiske Meddelelser," Vol. XXXI, No. 3.) Copenhagen, 1948. Pp. 90. Kr. 12.

The laryngeal hypothesis is now at last passing beyond the stage of hypothesis to that of apodeixis. In the future no history of any IE language and no account of IE as a whole that ignores IE *h*, will be worth much attention. The new IE etymological dictionary of Pokorny is defective on this ground alone. At first postulated by a few venturesome searchers of the skies—notably De Saussure, Möller, and Cuny—then actually brought within our ken (from Hittite) by Sturtevant, traces of *h* have been spotted by others here and there in the derivative languages. Last summer, for the first time, I dared to teach in a class (at Chicago) what had been maturing in my mind for some time, the doctrine that the Greek *spiritus lenis* had been a true consonant, the relic of *h* before a vowel—adding, greatly daring, that this might be the reason why it sometimes makes position in Homer—just as the *spiritus asper* is the relic of other consonants (*s, i, y*, or combinations of those sounds); and I have repeated that explanation to another class this year. Now Hammerich comes along with the same view. Not that this is all that he has done. In fact, his is the first attempt that I have seen to formulate a consistent account of IE *h* as part of the phonematic pattern of IE in a position other than before and after vowels. Hammerich's notable contribution to our knowledge is ostensibly devoted to the specific situation of *h* before *m, n, l, r, i* and *y*; actually, he deals, in the course of his exposition, with some other situations (notably *h* before *u*), and he makes some striking suggestions for the solution of long-standing difficulties (conspicuously, Greek initial *h*, Greek *χθ-, φθ-, κτ-*; Italic *f*; the Keltic loss of *p-*, but not of *t-, k-*; Germanic *-zd-* as in Gothic *huzd*, "hoard," and *gazds*, "goad"; Greek *ζ-* in *ζυγόν* and the like). Not all these are equally illuminating, but most are convincing.

Most satisfactory are his rejection of Indo-Hittite, which by no means all "other American scholars" (p. 65) have accepted, and his insistence upon a phonetic interpretation of *h*. He finds it unnecessary to assume more than one IE laryngeal phoneme (Pedersen has two, Couvreur three, Sturtevant four, and Cuny, at least for his "langue nostratique," five),

though Hammerich admits that "pre-Indo-European" may have had more, and he hints, what most of us are now beginning to anticipate, that external relations of IE with other languages (presumably Semitic and Hamitic) are about to be demonstrated and not merely guessed at. Consonantal alternants (e.g., of the type  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}:\delta\gamma\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron$ ) will be given a rational explanation; and vocalic alternation (ablaut) appears to Hammerich, whose views on this subject he himself describes as "heretical," is doubtless going to be presented differently from the way in which it appears in some recent, but highly speculative, expositions. Here, however, Hammerich's warnings (p. 76) should be heeded. I agree with him that the alternation  $e:o (:a)$  must be phonematic—at least to this extent, that it originally was morphologically such, although (I think) it need not have been so lexically at a very remote date; and that when vocalization appears (of  $\bar{H}$  or a "reduced" and even of a "vanishing" grade  $e$ ) the accentual theory is inadequate to explain the facts. And I certainly agree that this field of study promises to be fruitful. In fact, any new IE grammar will be as different from Brugmann's as his was from Bopp's—the change may even be greater.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*A History of the American School of Classical Studies, 1882-1942.* By LOUIS E. LORD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. 417+44 pls.+2 plans. \$5.00.

The author of this book has been chairman of the Managing Committee of the School since 1939. He says virtually nothing of his own administration, and it is hardly clear why the date 1942 is used in the title. The main part of the book is divided into four chapters, devoted, respectively, to the periods during which four men (White, Seymour, Wheeler, and Capps) held the chairmanship. There are six appendixes: I, "The First Year of the School," by Harold N. Fowler; II, "How I Became a Captain in the Greek Army," by Walter Miller; III, "List of Excavations Conduct-

ed by the School"; IV, "Publications of the School"; V, "Funds of the School"; VI, "Directory of Trustees, Managing Committee, Faculty and Students, 1882-1942." The narrative includes both the administration and the scholarly activities of the School, although the latter are naturally not presented very fully. The plates are good pictures, and in looking through them one gains some idea of the School's achievements; usually they do not correspond specifically to anything in the text.

The book is written in sprightly style, with touches of humor that cheer the reader without detaining him. (It is hoped that "Geranian Nestor" is not one of these, but a misprint.) The author apparently enjoys setting down succinct judgments on recent and contemporary scholars. The judgments are not always laudatory, but Meritt is said to be more highly regarded by European scholars than any other American classicist. Perhaps that will not hurt Meritt, and it might have a salutary effect on one or two other Americans. With similar decisiveness it is stated that the School is now "recognized as the leading foreign school in Hellas." That may be true, but it is regrettable that ineluctable necessity required the statement from an American. Prospective donors might be impressed by it; and perhaps it is to them, and to present and past members of the Managing Committee, that the book as a whole is primarily addressed, though plenty of other readers will find interest in parts of it. One question it might well answer, but does not: What considerations led to the choice of a name for *Hesperia*?

Appendix II tells of what is perhaps the most heroic exploit in the history of the School. Energy such as the late Professor Miller showed in 1886, in resisting and later capturing two outlaws, was really Homeric. Many residents at the School could contribute narratives which, though lacking the epic character of Professor Miller's, might make a book of some interest; the trouble is that most of them would involve more than one resident and probably more than one version.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago



*Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388.* By KENNETH M. SETTON. ("Mediaeval Academy of America Publications," No. 50.) Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1948. Pp. xvi+323+8 pls. \$7.50 (\$6.00 to members of the Academy).

Love of Athens and admiration for Catalonia were the motive power in the production of this scholarly volume. It is, as the author aptly says, "the first book, in its way, which has for its sole and central theme the whole history of the Catalan domination of Athens" (p. vii). In the year 1311 an association of military adventurers, known as the "Catalan Grand Company," founded in the formerly French duchy of Athens a "soldier-state," which, notwithstanding an unstable government under absentee dukes (belonging to the Catalan royal houses of Sicily and Aragon), endured for three-quarters of a century. To the political and administrative history of this state Professor Setton has devoted the first nine chapters of his book. In the tenth chapter, after a detailed description of the circumstances attendant upon the Catalan loss of Athens, he presents succinctly the history of the city in the period from 1388 to its capture by the Turks in 1456, during which period it was ruled by Florentines, save for an interval of Venetian lordship between 1395 and 1403. Follows a discussion, in forty-five pages, of "language and culture, social conditions and Athenian antiquities under the Catalans and Florentines." The final chapter is a bibliographical survey, more nearly complete than any previously available, of the sources and the important secondary writings that bear upon the history of Athens in the Catalan and Florentine periods.

Though Mr. Setton freely acknowledges that he derived much guidance from the works of learned predecessors in the field—such as Buchon, Hopf, Gregorovius, Lampros, William Miller, and, in particular, the eminent Catalan historian, Antonio Rubió y Lluich (d. 1937)—his book must not be mistaken for merely a skilful combination of their respective contributions to the subject. It is a fresh and penetratively critical study, resting mainly upon

contemporary sources, which include, besides narrative accounts, several hundreds of documents and also other types of source material (coins, seals, etc.). Despite some unnecessary repetition of facts and ideas, the volume is quite readable, thanks to its author's engaging and vigorous style. The numerous references in it to outstanding men and events, to institutions and monuments, of antiquity should considerably enhance its interest to perusers of this *Journal*.

EINAR JORANSON

*University of Chicago*

*Eratosthenes und die alexandrinische Stern-dichtung.* By GOTTFRIED ALBERT KELLER. (Dissertation, Zurich, 1946).

Eratosthenes' *Erigone* must have included the *katasterismoi* of the Attic farmer Icarius, his daughter Erigone, and their faithful dog Maira. His *Hermes* described the god as ascending from the earth to heaven, passing through the planetary spheres and enjoying a vision of the celestial system, a concert of the spheres, and a bird's-eye view of the earth with its zones.

Keller rightly stresses the kinship between *aitia* poetry and the literary treatment of *katasterismoi*. He points out that Callimachus, who pioneered in the former subject, also gave a strong impulse to the latter. Strictly speaking, his poem on the death of Arsinoë does not describe a *katasterismos* but the *Πλόκαμος* does, drawing a parallel between the honor bestowed on the lock and the crown of Ariadne. To the latter story Apollonius (iii. 1002 f.) and Aratus (vss. 71 f.) had referred even earlier. Aratus also identifies the *Παρθένος* with the goddess Dike, who has withdrawn from the earth and its sins (vss. 96 ff.); on the whole, however, he pays little attention to *katasterismoi* and his influence on Eratosthenes may indeed, as Keller suggests, have been secondary to that of Callimachus.

I agree with Keller that the presence of Egyptian motifs in Eratosthenes' poems is not proved. His analysis of the mythographic tradition concerning Icarius and Erigone is most painstaking; yet I cannot see that his results

differ greatly from the conclusions reached by Ernst Maass in his *Analecta Eratosthenica*. The *Erigone* certainly touched on the *aition* of Attic tragedy; yet it is doubtful whether it included as full a treatment as Keller believes. And did Eratosthenes really "invent" (pp. 47 ff.) the *katasterismoi* of Icarus and Erigone? I submit that his originality rather lies in the new turn which he gave the subject. In the *Erigone* it is not the bodies but the souls of these two characters which are given a place in heaven. This is the version which Nonnus has preserved in a passage (*Dion*. xlvii. 256 ff.; cf. my paper *TAPA*, LXXVIII, 252 ff.), which Keller—following Maass—dismisses as reflecting Egyptian beliefs (p. 86).

Keller refers on page 15 in rather general terms to the religious background of Alexandrian star-poetry. On page 118 he mentions that Eratosthenes discussed the nature of Soul in his *Platonicus*. It is a pity that it did not occur to him to investigate the connection between Eratosthenes' Platonic beliefs and the *katasterismoi* of the *Erigone*.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

Cornell University

*Inventaire de l'archéologie gallo-romaine du département de l'Aveyron*. By ALEXANDRE ALBENQUE. Rodez: P. Carrère, 1947. Pp. 206+7 pls. Fr. 390.<sup>1</sup>

The author, principal of the lycée at Rodez, has presented an extremely useful account of the antiquities of the territory of that part of the Celtic tribe of Ruteni which, at the time of Caesar's arrival, was outside the old province and which later constituted the *civitas* of Ruteni in the province of Aquitania. This is a land of ravines and valleys and of the barren uplands of the Grands Causses. It is the home of the La Graufesenque pottery, of important

<sup>1</sup> The publisher's address is Place de la Cité, Rodez, Aveyron, France.

mines, and of an unusual industry—the distilling of pitch. There are few spectacular finds, but the cumulative effect is impressive. The book definitely gives the impression of careful work by a competent scholar.

After an introductory statement about the history of local investigations, there follows a bibliography (pp. 19–44), an "Inventaire géographique" (pp. 45–171 with two supplements included), and a "Répertoire archéologique" (pp. 173–92). Finally, there are three appendixes (pp. 193–204), discussing the aqueduct of Segodunum, the capital of the *civitas*, the roads of the district, and the place names. The "Inventaire" arranges the material by place names in alphabetical order and contains, with the supplements, 551 entries. This, of course, is only a very rough indication of the number of objects found, since some entries merely record the finding of fragments of tiles, while others list numerous articles. Nos. 87 (pp. 61–65) and 207 (pp. 92–94) give descriptions of villas with plans, and No. 247 (pp. 100–102) similarly gives a description with plan of the baths of a third villa, while No. 187 (pp. 83–88 and Pls. II and III) describes the site of the La Graufesenque potteries. The "Répertoire archéologique" is an alphabetical list of objects found with references to the entries concerned. This, of course, makes possible a quick check of the finds of any particular kind of object. To illustrate, there is a mass of entries referring to finds of pottery, but only one reference under "Four de potier"—No. 139, reporting a furnace used for baking La Tène pottery—and relatively few under "Atelier céramique," but one of these is No. 187, La Graufesenque. When the latter entry is read, the scarcity of remains of potters' kilns becomes clear; the excavators did not go far enough to reach them.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, Vol. IV, (1948), Nos. 2 and 3. Bogotá, 1948.
- BUSCHOR, ERNST. *Das hellenistische Bildnis*. München: Biederstein Verlag, 1949. Pp. 71+16 pls. DM 12.
- BUTLER, H. E. (ed.). *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond: Concerning the Acts of Samson, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Edmund*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xxviii+306. \$5.00.
- CASTORINA, EMANUELE. *I "Poetae novelli"*. Firenze: La nuova Italia, 1949. Pp. xv+228. L. 550.
- CHASE, ALSTON HURD, and PHILLIPS, HENRY, JR. *A New Introduction to Greek*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xii+186+8 pls. \$4.00.
- Classica et mediaevalia: Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, Vol. X, No. 1. Copenhagen: Librairie Gyldendal; New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1949.
- DAHLMANN, HELLFRIED (ed.). *L. Annaeus Seneca: De brevitate vitae*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1949. Pp. 88. DM 4.50.
- FAYE, C. U. (ed.). *Fifteenth Century Printed Books at the University of Illinois*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. Pp. 160. \$3.00.
- FRISCH, HARTVIG. *Might and Right in Antiquity, "Dike" I: From Homer to the Persian Wars*. Translated by C. C. MARTINDALE. ("Humanitas," Vol. II.) Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1949. Pp. 276. Kr. 30.
- FUCHS, HARALD (ed.). *Tacitus: Annales*. ("Editiones Helveticae.") Vol. I: *Books i-vi*; Vol. II: *Books xi-xvi*. Frauenfeldae: Huber & Co., 1946-49. Pp. 252; 249. Vol. I, Swiss Fr. 5; Vol. II, Fr. 6.
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR. *Le Déchiffrement des inscriptions minoennes*. (Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-philologique, Vol. XLV [1948-49], Part 4: *Linguistique et littérature*.) Sofia, 1949. Pp. 81.
- GRENIER, ALBERT. *Les Religions étrusque et romaine*. VENDRYÈS, JOSEPH; TONNELAT, ERNEST; and UNBEGAUN, B. O. *Les Religions des Celtes, des Germains et des anciens Slaves*. ("Mana": *Introduction à l'histoire des religions*, Vol. II: *Les Religions de l'Europe ancienne*, Part 3.) Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1948. Pp. iv+467. Fr. 500.
- HADDAD, GEORGE. *Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. (Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.) Pp. vi+196. \$2.50. (Distributed by Hafner Pub. Co., 31 East Tenth St., New York 3, N.Y.)
- HARSH, PHILIP WHALEY. *Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus*. ("Stanford University Publications, University Ser., Language and Literature," Vol. VII, No. 2.) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1949. Pp. 149. \$2.50.
- HÉLIN, MAURICE. *A History of Medieval Latin Literature*. Rev. ed. Trans. by JEAN CHAPMAN SNOW. New York: William Salloch, 1949. Pp. vi+130. \$3.00.
- Hermathena*, No. LXXIII. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd., 1949. 3s.
- HIGHET, GILBERT. *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xxxviii+763. \$6.00.
- HOHL, ERNST (ed.). *Maximini duo Iulii Capitolini: Aus dem Corpus der sog. Historia Augusta herausgegeben und erläutert*. Berlin: Verlag von Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1949. Pp. 40. Rm 3.50.
- HOUGH, EDITH LOUISE. *Sicily: The Fabulous Island*. Franchestown, N.H.: Marshall Jones Co., 1949. Pp. 241. \$4.00.
- KAKRIDIS, JOHANNES TH. *Homeric Researches*. ("Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund," Vol. XLV.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1949. Pp. viii+173. Kr. 15.
- KARLGREN, BERNHARD. *The Chinese Language: An Essay on Its Nature and History*. New York: Ronald Press, 1949. Pp. vi+122. \$3.50.
- DE LAET, SIEGFRIED J. *Portorium: Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains, surtout à l'époque du haut-empire*. Brugge (Belgium): De Tempel, 1949. Pp. 510.

- LAUSBERG, HEINRICH. *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Einführung für Studierende der romanischen Philologie*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1949. Pp. 93. DM 4.50.
- VAN LENNEP, D. F. W. *Euripides: Selected Plays with Introduction, Metrical Synopsis, and Commentary, Part I: The Alkestis*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1949. Pp. 156. 6.50 guilders.
- LIND, L. R. *The Epitome of Andreas Vesalius*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. xxxvi+103. \$7.50.
- MCCRACKEN, GEORGE E. (trans.). *Arnobius of Sicca: The Case against the Pagans, Newly Translated and Annotated*. ("Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation," eds. JOHANNES QUASTEN and JOSEPH C. PLUMPE, Nos. 7 and 8.) 2 vols. Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1949. Pp. 659. \$6.75.
- MAROUZEAU, J. *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire*. ("Collection linguistique publiée par la Société linguistique de Paris.") Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Fr. 600.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. XIX. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949. Pp. 145.
- NUCHELMANS, JAN C. F. *Die Nomina des Sophokleischen Wortschatzes: Vorarbeiten zu einer sprachgeschichtlichen und stilistischen Analyse*. Utrecht: J. L. Beyers N.V., 1949. Pp. 128.
- PIWONKA, MARIO PUELMA. *Lucilius und Kallimachos: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1949. Pp. 411.
- POWELL, J. ENOCH (trans.). *Herodotus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Vol. I, pp. xxxii+353; Vol. II, pp. 354-773. \$6.00.
- RUPPRECHT, KARL. *Abriss der griechischen Veralehre*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1949. Pp. 64. DM 2.90.
- Siculorum gymnasium: Rassegna semestrale della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell' Università di Catania*, Vol. I, No. 2 (July-December, 1948). Catania: Università di Catania, 1948. L. 750.
- STILLWELL, AGNES NEWHALL. *The Potlery Quarter. (Corinth: Results of the Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XV, Part I.)* Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1948. Pp. xiv+138+52 pls.
- STRÖMBERG, REINHOLD. *Om Plutarchos' Skrift ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕΙΣΙΑΙΜΟΝΙΑΣ: Ett Bidrag till Skildringen av senantikens Religiositet*. Reprinted from *Festskrift till Axel Boëthius*. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1949. Kr. 1.
- WACE, ALAN J. B. *Mycenae: An Archaeological History and Guide*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949. Pp. xviii+150+110 pls. \$15.00.

Kalli-  
der hel-  
rt am  
p. 411.  
2 vols.  
Oxford  
i + 353;

a Vera-  
1949.

le della  
sità di  
1948).  
L. 750.  
Quar-  
nduct-  
Studies  
N.J.;  
es at

Skrift  
Skil-  
rinted  
eborg:  
Kr. 1.  
logical  
aceton  
+ 110